Swartz et al v. Di Carlo Doc. 25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

JAMES R. SWARTZ, JR, et al.,) CASE NO. 1:12CV3112
Plaintiffs,))) JUDGE CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO
vs.))
MARK A. DICARLO,)) <u>ORDER</u>)
Defendant.)))

This Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation (Doc.# 14) of Magistrate Judge Kenneth S. McHargh regarding the Motion of Plaintiffs James R. Swartz, Jr., et al., for Remand (Doc.#8). The Magistrate Judge recommended that Plaintiffs' Motion for Remand be denied, and that Defendant be granted ten days in which to correct the defects in the Notice of Removal. On February 20, 2013, Defendant filed Mark A. Dicarlo's Compliance with Report and Recommendations.

FED. R. CIV.P. 72(b) provides that objections to a Report and Recommendation must be filed within fourteen days after service, but Plaintiffs have failed to timely file any such objections. Therefore, the Court must assume that Plaintiffs are satisfied with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. Any further review by this Court would be a duplicative and inefficient use of the Court's limited resources. Thomas v. Arn, 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984), aff'd, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th

Cir.1981).

Therefore, the Court adopts in full the Report and Recommendation (Doc.# 14), and denies Plaintiffs' Motion for Remand.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 3/8/2013

S/Christopher A. Boyko
CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE