

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PORTLAND DIVISION

EVRAZ INC., NA, a Delaware Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

RIDDELL WILLIAMS P.S.,

v.

THE CONTINENTAL INSURANCE COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation; CENTRAL NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF OMAHA, a Nebraska corporation; CENTURY INDEMNITY COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation; GRANITE STATE INSURANCE COMPANY, a Pennsylvania corporation; AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE COMPANY, a New York corporation; HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, a Connecticut corporation; INSURANCE COMPANY OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, a Pennsylvania corporation; NATIONAL UNION FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF PITTSBURGH PA, a Pennsylvania company; RLI INSURANCE COMPANY, an Illinois corporation; STONEWALL INSURANCE COMPANY, a Nebraska corporation; WESTCHESTER FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, a New York corporation; WESTPORT INSURANCE CORPORATION, a Missouri corporation; ZURICH-AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY, a New York corporation,

Defendants,

No. 3:08-cv-00447-AC

OPINION AND ORDER

**THE CONTINENTAL INSURANCE
COMPANY, a Pennsylvania
corporation,**

Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.

**INSURANCE COMPANY OF THE
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, a
Pennsylvania corporation; and
AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE
COMPANY, a foreign insurance
company,**

Third Party Defendants,

**CONTINENTAL INSURANCE
COMPANY, a Pennsylvania
corporation,**

Counter Claimant,

v.

**EVRAZ OREGON STEEL MILLS,
INC., a Delaware corporation,**

Counter Defendant,

**INSURANCE COMPANY OF THE
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, a
Pennsylvania corporation; and
AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE
COMPANY, a foreign insurance
company,**

Third-Party Plaintiffs,

v.

TIG INSURANCE COMPANY,

Third-Party Defendant,

TIG INSURANCE COMPANY,

Counter Claimant,

v.

**CONTINENTAL INSURANCE
COMPANY, a Pennsylvania
corporation,**

Counter Defendant.

MOSMAN, J.,

On September 2, 2015, Magistrate Judge John Acosta issued his Findings and Recommendation (F&R) [377], recommending that I GRANT Plaintiff Evraz, Inc. and Defendant Hartford Fire Insurance Company's Unopposed Motion to Approve Settlement [368]. No objections to the Findings and Recommendation were filed.

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, *de novo* or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Acosta's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [377]
as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 24th day of September, 2015.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Judge