

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

**CORY LOVELADY,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**LEGACY HEALTH,**

Defendant.

Case No. 3:24-cv-1014-SB

**ORDER**

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

United States Magistrate Judge Stacie F. Beckerman issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on February 14, 2025. Judge Beckerman recommends that this Court grant Defendant's motion to dismiss. Judge Beckerman recommends that the Court dismiss with prejudice Plaintiff's claims under Oregon Revised Statutes § 659A.030 as time barred and dismiss with leave to amend Plaintiff's claims under Title VII. No party has filed objections.

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 objects 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 Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 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, the Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent.

The Court ADOPTS Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 21. The Court GRANTS Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, ECF 10. The Court dismisses with prejudice Plaintiff’s claims under Oregon Revised Statutes § 659A.030. The Court dismisses Plaintiff’s claims under Title VII with leave to amend. Plaintiff may file a first amended complaint within 14 days of this Order. If Plaintiff fails timely to file an amended complaint, the Court will enter a Judgment dismissing this case.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 5th day of March, 2025.

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