

1

2

3

4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5

* * *

6

GEORGE GERAINE EDWARDS,

Case No. 2:17-CV-2267 JCM (NJK)

7

Plaintiff(s),

ORDER

8

v.

9

DAVID HASSLEHOFF,

Defendant(s).

10

11

12

13

Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Koppe's report and recommendation (R&R), recommending that pro se plaintiff George Edwards's complaint (ECF Nos. 1-1) be dismissed with prejudice, and application to proceed in forma pauperis denied. (ECF No. 3). No objections have been filed, and the deadline for filing objections has since passed by over two months.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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).

23

24

25

26

27

28

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).

Nonetheless, the court has reviewed the complaint and the R&R and has determined that adopting the R&R is merited. Plaintiff purports to bring claims against David Hasslehoff, alleging that he forced her to become homeless and raped her to fulfill a sexual fetish. (ECF No. 1-1 at 1). Plaintiff has previously sued Mr. Hasslehoff in this court based on allegations that he impregnated her without her consent. See Edwards v. Hasslehoff, No. 2:14-cv-2169-RFB-PAL (D. Nev.). In that case, Magistrate Judge Leen recommended the complaint be dismissed “because [plaintiff’s] claims are fantastic and delusional.” Id., ECF No. 2 at 3. So too here.

In accordance with Judge Koppe's recommendation, in light of the frivolous, delusional, and wholly implausible nature of plaintiff's claims, the complaint will be dismissed and the application to proceed in forma pauperis denied as moot.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that Magistrate Judge Koppe's report and recommendation (ECF No. 3) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED in its entirety.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the complaint (ECF No. 1-1) is DISMISSED with prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 1) is DENIED as moot.

DATED November 9, 2017.

James C. Mahan
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE