

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  
★ DEC 07 2016 ★

-----X  
JOHN SAVARESE,

Plaintiff,

-against-

J.P. MORGAN CHASE, ET AL.,

Defendants.  
-----X

LONG ISLAND OFFICE

ORDER  
16-CV-321 (JFB) (SIL)

JOSEPH F. BIANCO, District Judge:

Before the Court is a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) from Magistrate Judge Locke recommending that defendants’ motion to compel arbitration and stay this action be granted.

The R&R instructed that any objections to the R&R be submitted within fourteen (14) days of service of the R&R. (See R&R, dated November 16, 2016, at 19.) The date for filing any objections has since expired, and none of the parties has filed any objection to the R&R. For the reasons set forth below, the Court adopts the thorough and well-reasoned R&R.

Where there are no objections, the Court may adopt the report and recommendation without *de novo* review. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”); see also *Mario v. P & C Food Mkts., Inc.*, 313 F.3d 758, 766 (2d Cir. 2002) (“Where parties receive clear notice of the consequences, failure timely to object to a magistrate’s report and recommendation operates as a waiver of further judicial review of the magistrate’s decision.”); cf. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3) (requiring *de novo* review after objections). However, because the failure to file timely objections is not jurisdictional, a district judge may still excuse the failure to object in a timely manner and exercise its discretion to decide the case on the merits to, for example, prevent plain error. See *Cephas v. Nash*,

328 F.3d 98, 107 (2d Cir. 2003) (“[B]ecause the waiver rule is non jurisdictional, we ‘may excuse the default in the interests of justice.’” (quoting *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 155)).

Although all parties have waived any objection to the R&R and thus *de novo* review is not required, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the R&R in an abundance of caution. Having conducted a review of the full record and the applicable law, and having reviewed the R&R *de novo*, the Court adopts the findings and recommendations contained in the well-reasoned and thorough R&R and grants defendants’ motion to compel arbitration and stay this action.

~~CONSIDERED.~~  
Joseph Bianco  
Joseph F. Bianco  
United States District Judge

Dated: December 7, 2016  
Central Islip, New York