

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

* * *

VINCENT PINDER,

Plaintiff,

v.

RENEE BAKER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:13-cv-00572-MMD-WGC

ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE WILLIAM G. COBB

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (dkt. no. 75) (“R&R”) relating to Plaintiff’s Motions for a Temporary Restraining Order (dkt. no. 39) and Preliminary Injunction (dkt. no. 40). Plaintiff had until June 18, 2015, to object to the R&R. No objection to the R&R has been filed.

This 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 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). 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


1 *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard
2 of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to
3 which no objections were made); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219,
4 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the
5 view that district courts are not required to review “any issue that is not the subject of an
6 objection.”). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, then
7 the court may accept the recommendation without review. *See, e.g., Johnstone*, 263 F.
8 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge’s recommendation to
9 which no objection was filed).

10 Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to
11 determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cobb’s R&R. The Magistrate Judge
12 recommended denying Plaintiff’s Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (dkt. no. 39)
13 and Preliminary Injunction (dkt. no. 40). Upon reviewing the R&R and underlying briefs,
14 this Court finds good cause to adopt the Magistrate Judge’s R&R in full.

15 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and
16 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (dkt. no. 75) is accepted and
17 adopted in its entirety.

18 It is ordered that Plaintiff’s Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (dkt. no. 39)
19 and Preliminary Injunction (dkt. no. 40) are denied.

20 DATED THIS 23rd day of June 2015.

21
22 
23 _____
24 MIRANDA M. DU
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28