1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	* * *	
9	LARRY D. REAVES,	Case No. 3:14-cv-00557-MMD-WGC
10	Plaintiff,	Case No. 3:14-cv-00594-MMD-WGC Case No. 3:14-cv-00658-MMD-WGC
11	V.	Case No. 3:14-cv-00671-MMD-WGC Case No. 3:15-cv-00027-MMD-WGC
12	RIVERO, et al., Defendants.	Case No. 3:15-cv-00033-MMD-WGC Case No. 3:15-cv-00049-MMD-WGC
13	Delendants.	Case No. 3:15-cv-00052-MMD-WGC Case No. 3:15-cv-00053-MMD-WGC Case No. 3:15-cv-00078-MMD-WGC
14		Case No. 3.13-60-00076-10100D-00GC
15		ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
16		OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE WILLIAM G. COBB
17		
18	Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate	
19	Judge William G. Cobb (dkt. no. 3) ("R&R") relating to plaintiff's initiation of forty-seven	
20	separate cases in this District. The Defendants include various entities, including the	
21	Department of Veteran Affairs, Second Judicial Security Officers, Western Union, VA	
22	Police, VA Sierra Nevada Healthcare Services, VA Medical Center, the Social Security	
23	Administration, Men's Shelter of Reno, Nevada, Barak Obama, TEAM, AMVET, JOH	
24	Blankenship, Criminal Division, Judge, District Attorney, San Mateo County, Veterans	
25	Services, Reno International Airport, Delta Airlines, Southwest Airlines, U.S. Airways,	
26	Inc., American Airlines, TSA, Amtrak, VA Regional Offices, Hilton Gardens Inn, DAV,	
27	Motel 6, Jose Rivero, Mrs. Becky, U.S. Navy, and U.S. Navy Reserve. No objection to	
28	the R&R has been filed.	

This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or 1 2 recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party 3 timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is 4 required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [report and 5 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 6 7 that is not the subject of an objection." Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). 8 Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a 9 magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See 10 United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard 11 of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to 12 which no objections were made); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 13 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the 14 view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an 15 objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then 16 the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., Johnstone, 263 F. 17 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to which no objection was filed). 18

Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to 19 20 determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cooke's R&R. The R&R points out that in 21 this action initiated, the Court ordered that Plaintiff either pay the filing fee or submit a proper application to proceed in forma pauperis. (3:14-cv-00557-MMD-WGC, dkt. no. 3.) 22 In response to the Court's order, Plaintiff submitted an IFP application, but it is largely 23 illegible, does not state facts as to his poverty with any particularity, and does not appear 24 to have been signed by Plaintiff under penalty of perjury. (3:14-cv-00557-MMD-WGC, 25 dkt. no. 4.) As further discussed in Magistrate Judge Cobb's R&R, for the most part, the 26 "initiating documents" consist of pages that appear to vaguely-mimic the format of a 27 complaint, sometimes including a caption, but then just contain random words such as 28

2

"terrorism" and "corruption," or dates and numbers with scribbled notes that are by and 1 2 large indecipherable. (See id.) Some of the "initiating documents" also include copies of blank forms from various government agencies such as instructions for depositing social 3 security checks (see id.), forms regarding identity theft and instructions from the Social 4 5 Security Administration (see, e.g., 3:14-cv-00658-MMD-WGC, dkt. no. 1-1), and even receipts from fast food restaurants and other stores (see dkt. no. 3:14-cv-00595-RCJ-6 WGC at dkt. no. 1-1 at 7). Others contain a caption page and nothing else. (See 3:14-cv-7 00659-RCJ-WGC at dkt. no. 1-1, 3:15-cv-00052-MMD-WGC at dkt. no. 1-1.) The Court 8 agrees that each of these actions should be dismissed because they are clearly frivolous 9 and fail to state any claim upon which relief may be granted. The actions are 10 incomprehensible, and contain no factual allegations, but merely words on pages, 11 occasionally accompanied by a document that may or may not have any relevance to 12 the words contained on the associated pages. Upon reviewing the R&R and Plaintiff's 13 filings in his cases before this Court, this Court finds good cause to accept and adopt the 14 Magistrate Judge's R&R in full. 15

16 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and
17 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (dkt. no. 3) is accepted and
18 adopted in its entirety.

19 It is further ordered that each of plaintiff's complaints listed above is dismissed
 20 with prejudice.

The Clerk is directed to close this case.

DATED THIS 27<sup>th</sup> day of April 2015.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MĪRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

3