

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

* * *

ERNEST GUARDADO,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES DZURENDA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-01923-ART-DJA

ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff Ernest Guardado brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated his Eighth Amendment rights by the general lack of prompt medical treatment and by the denial of immediate medical attention for a severe infection. Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States Magistrate Judge Daniel J. Albregts (ECF No. 41), which recommends that this Court dismiss Plaintiff’s case. The Court will adopt the R&R and dismiss the case.

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

