

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**NATHANIEL C. BALLARD,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**AVIS BUDGET CAR RENTAL, LLC,**

Defendant.

Case No. 03:19-cv-0042-YY

**ORDER**

**Michael H. Simon, District Judge.**

United States Magistrate Judge Youlee Yim You issued Findings and Recommendations in this case on October 25, 2019. ECF 23. Magistrate Judge You recommended that Avis's alternative motion to dismiss (ECF 20) be granted and that Mr. Ballard's claims be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution. No party has filed objections and Mr. Ballard has informed the Court that he will not be pursuing this action any further.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("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 judge'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).

PAGE 1 – ORDER

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

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the 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 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge You’s Findings and Recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge You’s Findings and Recommendations. ECF 23. Avis’s alternative motion to dismiss (ECF 20) is **GRANTED** and this case is dismissed with prejudice. Avis’s motion to compel is **DENIED** as moot.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 18th day of November, 2019.

/s/ Michael H. Simon  
Michael H. Simon  
United States District Judge