

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

CITIZENS BANK,)	CASE NO. 1:08 CV 2174
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
)	
)	Magistrate Judge William H. Baughman, Jr.
CINEMA PARK L.L.C. et al.,)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OPINION</u>
)	
Defendant.)	

This matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William H. Baughman (Document #128) recommending that the Court grant the Motion to Dismiss filed by Plaintiff (Docket #124), thereby dismissing Defendant Lightning Demolition and Excavating. Said Defendant has disclaimed any right, title, or interest in the property in dispute in this case.

No objections were filed to the Report and Recommendation. The Report and Recommendation (Document #128) is ADOPTED by this Court.

Standard of Review for a Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation

The applicable district court standard of review for a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation depends upon whether objections were made to the report. When objections are made to a report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court

reviews the case *de novo*. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b) provides:

The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

The text of Rule 72(b) addresses only the review of reports to which objections have been made; it does not indicate the appropriate standard of review for those reports to which no objections have been properly made. The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules commented on a district court's review of *unopposed* reports by magistrate judges. In regard to subsection (b) of Rule 72, the advisory committee stated: "When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." FED. R. CIV. P. 72 advisory committee's notes (citation omitted).

The U.S. Supreme Court stated in *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985): "It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings." Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation of the instant case *de novo*. See *Delgado v. Bowen*, 782 F.2d 79 (7th Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

The Court hereby ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Baughman (Document #128) in its entirety. Accordingly, the Motion to Dismiss filed by filed by Plaintiff (Docket #124) is GRANTED. Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Lightning Demolition and Excavating are hereby DISMISSED on the basis that said

Defendant has disclaimed any right, title, or interest in the subject property.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Donald C. Nugent
DONALD C. NUGENT
United States District Judge

DATED: March 4, 2009