UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * * * *

CHRISTOPHER A. JONES, Plaintiff, v. HOWARD SKOLNIK, *et al.*, Defendants.	3:10-cv-00162-LRH-VPC ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Christopher A. Jones' ("Jones") Objection to the Magistrate Judge's Order (Doc. #280[1]) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a), and Local Rule IB 3-1(a). Doc. #289. A magistrate judge's orders operate as final determinations of pretrial matters under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule IB 1-3. Accordingly, a district judge may reconsider a magistrate judge's order only if it is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); LR IB 3-1(a).

The Court has reviewed the relevant documents and pleadings on file in this matter and finds that the Magistrate Judge's Order, to which Jones objects, is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Therein, the Magistrate Judge addressed Jones' Motion to Determine the Sufficiency of Admissions (Doc. #253). *See* Doc. #280. Specifically, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the supplemental responses at issue and determined them to be acceptable. *See id.* Here, Jones asserts that his Motion (Doc. #253) was not completely, impartially, and fairly reviewed by the Magistrate Judge because she did not have the supplemental responses before

[1] Refers to the Court's docket entry number.

her for review. Jones' contention in this regard is entirely without merit. Jones himself provided a copy of the supplemental responses at issue to the Court in his Motion. *See* Doc. #253, Ex. A. As such, the Magistrate Judge's ruling that the supplemental responses shall stand was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Jones' Objection is overruled.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Jones' Objection (Doc. #289) is OVERRULED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 24th day of September, 2014.

LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE