

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

\* \* \*

RHENETTA BELCHER, et al.,  <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff(s),</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> AMBER BALTZLEY, et al.,  <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant(s).</p>		Case No. 2:17-CV-1675 JCM (NJK)  <p style="text-align: center;">ORDER</p>
---	--	---

Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Koppe’s report and recommendation (“R&R”). (ECF No. 7). 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 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).

1 Magistrate Judge Koppe’s R&R recommends that the court deny the applications to  
2 proceed in forma pauperis submitted by plaintiffs Rudd, Tolentino, and Santos. (ECF No. 7). The  
3 R&R further recommends that the court dismiss plaintiffs Rudd, Tolentino, and Santos from the  
4 action because “Plaintiffs were not properly joined under [Rule] 20.”<sup>1</sup> Id.

5 Plaintiffs have not objected to the report and recommendation. Nevertheless, this court  
6 finds it appropriate to engage in a de novo review to determine whether to adopt the  
7 recommendation of the magistrate judge. Upon reviewing the recommendation and underlying  
8 briefs, the court finds that good cause appears to adopt the magistrate judge’s findings.

9 Accordingly,

10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Magistrate Judge  
11 Koppe’s report and recommendation (ECF No. 7) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED in its  
12 entirety.

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff Rudd’s application to proceed in forma  
14 pauperis (ECF No. 3) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff Tolentino’s application to proceed in forma  
16 pauperis (ECF No. 4) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff Santos’s application to proceed in forma  
18 pauperis (ECF No. 5) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all claims brought by plaintiffs Rudd, Tolentino, and  
20 Santos be, and the same hereby are, DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

21 The clerk shall remove plaintiffs Rudd, Tolentino, and Santos from the instant action.

22 DATED February 2, 2018.

23   
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The R&R holds in the alternative that plaintiffs, who represent themselves pro se, did not properly bring their claims as a class action suit. (ECF No. 7).