Drozd v. McDaniel, et al Doc. 56

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

ALLYSON DROZD,

No. 3:17-cv-00556-JR

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

JEFFREY McDANIEL, LARRY GRAHAM, And KYLE SMITH, as individuals, CITY OF PORTLAND, and MULTNOMAH COUNTY,

Defendants.

HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

On December 4, 2018, Magistrate Judge Russo issued an Order [50] granting Defendants' Joint Motion to Compel [43]. On December 18, 2018, Plaintiff filed objections to the Order. The matter is now before me pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a).

In accordance with Rule 72(a), "[w]hen a pretrial matter not dispositive of a party's claim or defense is referred to a magistrate judge to hear and decide, the magistrate judge must promptly conduct the required proceedings and, when appropriate, issue a written order stating the decision." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The standard of review for an order with objections is

"clearly erroneous" or "contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) (applying the "clearly erroneous or contrary to law" standard of review for nondispositive motions). If a ruling on a motion is not determinative of "a party's claim or defense," it is not dispositive and, therefore, is not subject to de novo review as are proposed findings and recommendations for dispositive motions under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).

I have carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and conclude they do not provide a basis to modify the Magistrate Judge's Order.

CONCLUSION

The Court AFFIRMS Magistrate Judge Russo's Order [50].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 17 day of January, 2019.

MARCO A. HERNÁNDEZ United States District Judge