

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

**James Allen Reynolds, Jr. v. Experian Information Solutions
Incorporated, et al.**

Reynolds · No. CV-26-01004-PHX-JZB · Decided March 24, 2026

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF
ARIZONA 8 9 James Allen Reynolds, Jr, NO. CV-26-01004-PHX-JZB 10 Plaintiff, ORDER 11 v.
12 Experian Information Solutions Incorporated, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 This matter was
assigned to Magistrate Judge John Z. Boyle. (Doc. 4).

On March 4, 16 2026, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) with
this Court. 17 (Doc. 7). The Magistrate Judge recommends granting Plaintiff’s Application to
Proceed In 18 Forma Pauperis (Doc. 2), denying Plaintiff’s Motion to Allow Electronic Filing
(Doc. 3), 19 and dismissing this action with leave to amend.

To date, no objections have been filed. 20 1 This case is assigned to a Magistrate Judge. However,
not all parties have consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge. Thus, the matter is
before this Court pursuant 21 to General Order 21-25, which states in relevant part: 22 When a
United States Magistrate Judge to whom a civil action has been assigned pursuant to Local Rule
3.7(a)(1) considers dismissal to be 23 appropriate but lacks the jurisdiction to do so under 28
U.S.C. § 636(c)(1) due to incomplete status of election by the parties to consent or not consent 24
to the full authority of the Magistrate Judge, 25 IT IS ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge will
prepare a Report and Recommendation for the Chief United States District Judge or designee.

26 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED designating the following District Court 27 Judges to review and,
if deemed suitable, to sign the order of dismissal on my behalf: 28 Phoenix/Prescott: Senior
United States District Judge Stephen M. McNamee 1 STANDARD OF REVIEW 2 The Court
“may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or 3 recommendations made by
the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see *Baxter v. 4 Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir.

1991). Parties have fourteen days from the service 5 of a copy of the Magistrate’s
recommendation within which to file specific written 6 objections to the Court. 28 U.S.C. §
636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, 72. Failure to object to a 7 Magistrate Judge’s recommendation
relieves the Court of conducting de novo review of 8 the Magistrate Judge’s factual findings and
waives all objections to those findings on 9 appeal.

See *Turner v. Duncan*, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998). A failure to object to a 10 Magistrate
Judge’s conclusion “is a factor to be weighed in considering the propriety of 11 finding waiver of

an issue on appeal.” Id. 12 DISCUSSION2 13 Having reviewed the R&R of the Magistrate Judge, and no Objections having been 14 made by any party thereto, the Court hereby incorporates and adopts the R&R.

15 CONCLUSION 16 Accordingly, 17 IT IS ORDERED adopting the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate 18 Judge. (Doc. 7). 19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed In 20 Forma Pauperis. (Doc. 2). 21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying Plaintiff’s Motion to Allow Electronic 22 Filing by a Party Appearing Without an Attorney. (Doc. 3). 23 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED dismissing Plaintiff’s Complaint without 24 prejudice and with leave to amend.

(Doc. 1). 25 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff may file an amended complaint on or 26 before April 20, 2026. If Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint by this deadline, the 27 Clerk of the Court is directed to terminate this action. 28 2 The factual and procedural history of this case is set forth in the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (Doc.

7). 1 Dated this 20th day of March, 2026. 3 Stephen M. McNamee 4 Senior United States District Judge 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 _3-