

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

CHARLES N. BELSSNER,  
  
Plaintiff(s),  
  
v.  
  
ONE NEVADA CREDIT UNION,  
  
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-CV-1648 JCM (VCF)

ORDER

Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Ferenbach’s report and recommendation (R&R), recommending that pro se plaintiff Charles Belssner’s complaint (ECF Nos. 1-1 and 5)<sup>1</sup> be dismissed with prejudice. (ECF No. 4). No objections have been filed, and the deadline for filing objections has since passed.

This court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, then the court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See *United*

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff first attached the complaint to the motion to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 1-1). After the entry of the R&R, the clerk filed the complaint separately. (ECF No. 5). This order refers to both as “the complaint.”

James C. Mahan  
U.S. District Judge

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were made).

The deadline to object was August 17, 2017, and the plaintiff has still not done do so. Nevertheless, this court has reviewed the recommendation and underlying motion and finds that good cause appears to adopt the magistrate judge’s findings and rulings. Therefore, this court adopts the R&R in its entirety.


Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that Magistrate Judge Hoffman’s report and recommendation (ECF No. 4) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED in its entirety.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the complaint, (see ECF Nos. 1-1, 5), is DISMISSED with prejudice.

The clerk is instructed to close the case.

DATED September 6, 2017.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE