

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

JOSHUA EDWARD MASON,

Plaintiff,

v.

CARL ARMSTRONG OWNER/OPERATOR
SPOONY BAY LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. 6:17-cv-00845-TC
ORDER

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Thomas Coffin filed his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) on May 18, 2018 (doc. 23) recommending this action should be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with a court order. The matter is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

No objections have been timely filed. Although this relieves me of my obligation to perform a *de novo* review, I retain the obligation to “make an informed, final decision.” *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), *overruled on other grounds*, *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). The Magistrates Act does not specify a standard of review in cases where no objections are filed.

Ray v. Astrue, 2012 WL 1598239, *1 (D. Or. May 7, 2012). Following the recommendation of the Rules Advisory Committee, I review the F&R for “clear error on the face of the record[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (1983) (citing *Campbell v. United States District Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); see also *United States v. Vonn*, 535 U.S. 55, 64 n.6 (2002) (stating that, “[i]n the absence of a clear legislative mandate, the Advisory Committee Notes provide a reliable source of insight into the meaning of” a federal rule). Having reviewed the file of this case, I find no clear error.

Thus, I adopt Magistrate Judge Coffin’s F&R (doc. 23) in its entirety. Accordingly, this action is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 21st day of June, 2018.



Ann Aiken
United States District Judge