

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

* * *

FURNITURE ROYAL, INC.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

SCHNADIG INTERNATIONAL CORP,
et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:18-CV-318 JCM (DJA)

ORDER

Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Hoffman’s report and recommendation (“R&R”). (ECF No. 51).

Also before the court is Furniture Royal, Inc.’s (“plaintiff”) motion to amend. (ECF No. 37). Shnadig International Corp. (“defendant”) filed a response (ECF No. 40), to which plaintiff replied (ECF No. 47).

Judge Hoffman found that plaintiff’s proposed amendment was futile as to all claims except those for fraudulent misrepresentation and breach of contract. (ECF No. 51 at 3). Accordingly, Judge Hoffman recommends that plaintiff’s motion to amend be granted as to the fraudulent misrepresentation and breach of contract claims and denied as to the remainder. *Id.*

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).

