1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	* * *	
9	LARRY D. REAVES,	Case No. 3:14-cv-00602-MMD-VPC
10	Plaintiff,	Case No. 3:14-cv-00603-MMD-VPC Case No. 3:14-cv-00604-MMD-VPC
11		Case No. 3:14-cv-00609-MMD-VPC Case No. 3:14-cv-00646-MMD-VPC
12	SAN JOSE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, et al.,	Case No. 3:14-cv-00657-MMD-VPC Case No. 3:14-cv-00673-MMD-VPC
13	Defendants.	Case No. 3:15-cv-00025-MMD-VPC Case No. 3:15-cv-00028-MMD-VPC
14		Case No. 3:15-cv-00048-MMD-VPC Case No. 3:15-cv-00055-MMD-VPC
15		ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
16		OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE VALERIE P. COOKE
17		VALERIE F. COORE
18		
19	Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate	
20	Judge Valerie P. Cooke (dkt. no. 3) ("R&R") relating to plaintiff's initiation of forty-seven	
21	separate cases in this District. The Defendants include various entities, including the	
22	Department of Veteran Affairs, Greyhound Bus Lines, President Obama, the Governor of	
23	an unnamed state, Bay Area Rapid Transit ("BART"), Western Union, various local	
24	casinos and hotels, state court security guards, both the San Jose and Reno	
25	International Airports, the United States Post Office, and many other entities and	
26	individuals. No objection to the R&R has been filed.	
27	This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or	
28	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 1 2 required to "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and 3 recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails 4 to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue 5 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 6 7 magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See 8 United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard 9 of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to 10 which no objections were made); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 11 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the 12 view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an 13 objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then 14 the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., Johnstone, 263 F. 15 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to 16 which no objection was filed).

17 Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to 18 determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cooke's R&R. As discussed in Magistrate 19 Judge Cooke's R&R, in each of plaintiff's cases, the initiating documents are merely 20 nonsensical words and numbers sprawled on pieces of paper, sometimes with a copy of 21 a bus ticket or other receipt of some kind. (See, e.g., 3:14-cv-00617-RCJ-VPC); 3:14-cv-22 00673-MMD-VPC). Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a) states that a complaint must contain a short and 23 plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction, a claim showing that plaintiff is 24 entitled to relief, and the relief sought. Plaintiffs' documents contain mere gibberish, and 25 the sheer number of cases initiated since October 2014 are a clear indication that 26 plaintiff's claims, even if they were clearly articulated, would likely be based on 27 conclusions that are untenable. "It is not the court's job to wade through pages of 28 incoherent gobbledy-gook in search of a single claim that may have merit." Shalla! v.

2

1	Gates, 254 2 F.R.D. 140, 143 n. 6 (D.D.C. 2008). Upon reviewing the R&R and the		
2	filings in Plaintiffs' cases, this Court finds good cause to accept and adopt the Magistrate		
3	Judge's R&R in full.		
4	It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and		
5	Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Valerie P. Cooke (dkt. no. 3) is accepted and		
6	adopted in its entirety.		
7	It is further ordered that each of plaintiff's complaints listed above is dismissed		
8	with prejudice.		
9	The Clerk is directed to close this case.		
10	DATED THIS 27 <sup>th</sup> day of April 2015.		
11			
12	1		
13	/um-		
14	MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	3		