1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANSHU PATHAK,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHETNA PATHAK,

Defendant.

Defendant.

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,

Page 1 of 2

1	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 6), is
2	ADOPTED in full.
3	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case is DIMISSED for lack of subject matter
4	jurisdiction.
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion, (ECF No. 5), is DENIED
6	pursuant to the lack of jurisdiction.
7	The Clerk is instructed to close the case.
8	
9	DATED this 12 day of March, 2018.
10	
11	Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
12	United States District Court
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
2324	
25	