

1 Local Rule IB 3-2 does not entitle a party to file a reply to a response to any opposition to a
2 report and recommendation. Nonetheless, the court has considered Plaintiff's reply in reaching its
3 determination.

4 This action was referred to the Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local
5 Rule 1B 1-4 of the Rules of Practice of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

6 The Court has conducted its *de novo* review in this case, has fully considered the objections of
7 Plaintiff, Defendants' opposition to the objections, Plaintiff's reply, the pleadings and memoranda of
8 the parties and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) (B) and Local Rule
9 IB 3-2. The Court determines that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (#105) entered
10 on August 21, 2013, should be adopted and accepted.


11 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation
12 (#105) entered on August 21, 2013, is adopted and accepted, and Defendants' Motion for Summary
13 Judgment (#64) is **GRANTED in its entirety**.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Allow Late Reply Re Doc. 112 (#116)
15 is GRANTED.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment accordingly.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED this 23rd day of January, 2014.

20
21 
22 LARRY R. HICKS
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26