

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

**IVAN B. LANGLEY and  
KARLEE E. LANGLEY,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

No. 11-CV-774-PK

**SHIRLEY E. JONES and  
CHARLEE A. PHILLIPS, JR.,**

Defendants.

ORDER

Ivan B. Langley  
Karlee E. Langley  
29135 Langley Road  
Huntington, Oregon 97097  
Pro se

Timothy O'Hanlon  
Mautz & O'Hanlon  
P.O. Box 628  
Pendleton, Oregon 97801  
Attorney for Defendants

**SIMON, District Judge:**

On January 10, 2012, Magistrate Judge Paul Papak filed Findings and Recommendations in this case (doc. # 31). Judge Papak recommended that Plaintiffs' claims be dismissed for lack

of subject-matter jurisdiction, and that Plaintiffs be allowed 30 days to amend their complaint, if appropriate. No objections have been filed. [Plaintiffs have not filed an amended complaint.]

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the court may “accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If, however, no objections are filed, the Magistrates Act does not prescribe any standard of review. In such cases, “[t]here is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Magistrates Act] intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (court must review *de novo* magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No objections having been made, the court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Hubel’s findings and recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent.

Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendation

(docket # 31). Because Plaintiffs have not filed an amended complaint, this case is dismissed with prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2012.

/s/ Michael H. Simon

Michael H. Simon  
United States District Judge