

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

\* \* \*

MITCHELL KEITH GOODRUM,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CITY OF FALLON, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00539-MMD-WGC  
ORDER

*Pro se* Plaintiff Mitchell Goodrum filed a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1-1.) Goodrum has also filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) and a motion for appointment of counsel. (ECF Nos. 3, 4.) Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R” or “Recommendation”) of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (ECF No. 5), recommending that Goodrum’s IFP application be granted, motion for appointment of counsel be denied as moot, and that this case be dismissed without prejudice. Goodrum had until April 22, 2021 to file an objection. To date, no objection to the R&R has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the Court adopts Judge Cobb’s R&R and will dismiss this case without prejudice.

The 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 fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, 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, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

