

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

* * *

DANTE PATTISON,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:14-cv-00020-MMD-VPC

ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE
VALERIE P. COOKE

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Valerie P. Cooke (dkt. no. 138) (“R&R”) relating to plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction (dkt. no. 89). Plaintiff had until July 19, 2015, to object to the R&R. No objection 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 *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to


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

8 Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to
9 determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cooke’s R&R. The Magistrate Judge
10 recommended that plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction (dkt. no. 89) be denied.
11 Upon reviewing the R&R and underlying briefs, this Court finds good cause to adopt the
12 Magistrate Judge’s R&R in full.

13 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and
14 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Valerie P. Cooke (dkt. no. 138) is accepted and
15 adopted in its entirety.

16 It is ordered Plaintiff’s motion for injunction (dkt. no. 89) is denied.

17 DATED THIS 28th day of July 2015.

18
19 
20 _____
21 MIRANDA M. DU
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28