

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division**

**ELITE PLASTIC SURGERY, LLC**     )  
**Plaintiff,**                             )

**v.**                                     )

**Case No. 1:18cv409**

   )  
**OTITA GABRIELA HUEY,**         )  
**Defendant.**                         )  
   )

**ORDER**

On July 2, 2018, United States Magistrate Judge Theresa Carroll Buchanan entered a Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that plaintiff’s motion for default judgment be granted. Defendant is a former patient of the plaintiff who allegedly incurred \$116,748.00 in debt for various surgical procedures and has failed to make any payments towards this debt. By failing to appear in this matter and respond to plaintiff’s complaint, defendant has conceded that plaintiff’s factual allegations are true – *i.e.* that defendant owes \$116,748.00 for surgical procedures. Given the posture of this case, Judge Buchanan appropriately recommends that judgment be entered against defendant in the amount of \$116,748.00.

Having considered the record and Judge Buchanan’s thorough and well-reasoned Report, to which no objections have been filed, and having found no clear error,<sup>1</sup>

---

The Court **ADOPTS**, as its own, the findings of fact and recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge, as set forth in the Report (Doc. 12).

Accordingly,

It is hereby **ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for default judgment (Doc. 9) is **GRANTED**.


The Clerk of the Court is directed to provide a copy of this Order to all counsel of record and to the defaulting defendant at her last known address.

The Clerk is further directed to place this matter among the ended causes.

Final judgment shall issue separately.

Alexandria, Virginia

July 27, 2018

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**T. S. Ellis, III**  
**United States District Judge**

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (in the absence of any objections to a magistrate's report, the court "need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'").