

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

1 ANSHU PATHAK,)
2)
3)
4)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 vs.)
7)
8 CHETNA PATHAK,)
9)
10)
11)
12 Defendant.)
13)
14)
15)
16)
17)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)

Case No.: 2:18-cv-0157-GMN-NJK

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe, (ECF No. 6), which states that this Court does not have jurisdiction.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* 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); D. Nev. IB 3-2(b). 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, e.g., *United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.

Accordingly,

