IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PORTLAND DIVISION

RICHARD CHARLES WIMETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER SEAN SOTHERN, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 3:12-cv-01406-HU

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On July 11, 2013, Magistrate Judge Hubel issued his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") [54] in the above-captioned case recommending that plaintiff's motion [48] for an extension of time be denied as moot, plaintiff's motion [50] for leave to amend be granted, and defendants' motion [40] to dismiss be granted. No objections 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 Hubel's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R [54] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 31st day of July, 2013.

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