

1

2

3

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5

\* \* \*

6

VICTORIA-JOY GODWIN,

Case No. 2:17-cv-02178-MMD-DJA

7

Plaintiff,

ORDER

8

v.

9

SENIOR GARDEN APARTMENTS, *et al.*,

10

Defendants.

11

12

*Pro se* Plaintiff Victoria-Joy Godwin filed a fourth amended complaint against numerous defendants, including Clark County. (ECF No. 87 at 15.) Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Albregts (ECF No. 180), recommending that Defendant Clark County’s request for dismissal in their motion for an order quashing service (ECF No. 135) be granted, and that Clark County be dismissed from this action. Plaintiff had until January 19, 2021 to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts the R&R, and dismiss Clark County from the entirety of this case.

20

21

The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, 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); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory

25

26

27

28

1 Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no  
2 clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

3 Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct *de novo* review, and is  
4 satisfied Judge Albregts did not clearly err. Here, Judge Albregts recommends that Clark  
5 County be dismissed from this action as Plaintiff’s fourth amended complaint fails to state  
6 a claim against Clark County upon which relief can be granted. (ECF No. 180 at 2.) The  
7 Court agrees with Judge Albregts. Having reviewed the R&R and the record in this case,  
8 the Court will adopt the R&R in full.

9 It is therefore ordered that Judge Albregts’s Report and Recommendation (ECF  
10 No. 180) is accepted and adopted in full.

11 It is further ordered that Defendant Clark County is dismissed from the entirety of  
12 this case.

13 DATED THIS 21<sup>st</sup> Day of January 2021.

14  
15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 MIRANDA M. DU  
18 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28