

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

\* \* \*

RONNIE MONEY COLEMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN EROGUL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00649-MMD-WGC

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

*Pro se* Plaintiff Ronnie Money Coleman, an incarcerated person, brought this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (“R&R”) regarding Plaintiff’s motion to dismiss Defendant John Erogul (ECF No. 81) and Erogul’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 66). (ECF No. 86.) The period for the parties to object to the R&R has passed and no party has done so. The Court accepts and adopts the R&R.

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). 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); *see also 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 which no objections were made); *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the view that district courts are not required to review “any issue that is not the subject of an objection” and accepting, without review, a magistrate judge’s recommendation to which no objection was filed). The Court nonetheless engages in *de novo* review to determine whether to accept the R&R and finds it should be accepted.

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

In the R&R, Judge Cobb considered Plaintiff's motion to dismiss Erogul from this case and found dismissal appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 21. As a result, Judge Cobb also denied Erogul's motion for summary judgment as moot. The Court agrees with these rulings.

It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 86) is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

It is further ordered that Plaintiff's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 81) is granted.

It is further ordered that Defendant Erogul's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 66) is denied as moot.

DATED THIS 14<sup>th</sup> day of November 2019.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MIRANDA M. DU  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE