

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Milan Michael Kotevski v. Kash Patel, et al.

Kotevski · No. 2:25-cv-02160-GMN-BNW · Decided January 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation because no objections were filed by the deadline. The court dismisses Milan Michael Kotevski’s complaint without prejudice for failure to file a court-ordered amended complaint, denies other pending motions as moot, and directs the clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gloria M. Navarro
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	January 23, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02160-GMN-BNW
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice for failure to file a court-ordered amended complaint. No objections were filed, and the district court adopted the R&R in full.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When specific objections are filed to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations concerning matters that may not be finally determined by a magistrate judge, the district court must conduct de novo review of the objected-to portions. When no objections are filed, the district court is not required to conduct any review of issues not subject to objection.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited precedential value.
PARTIES	Milan Michael Kotevski v. Kash Patel, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- motion to amend

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to review the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no objections were filed.
2. Whether to adopt the Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal without prejudice for failure to file a court-ordered amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. When a party fails to object to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court is not required to conduct any review of issues that were not the subject of an objection.
2. The Complaint was dismissed without prejudice for failure to file the court-ordered amended complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.”” (at 1)

“IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Milan Michael Kotevski filed a Complaint and failed to file an amended complaint ordered by the court. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal without prejudice, and Plaintiff did not object before the January 13, 2026 deadline.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Brenda N. Weksler recommended dismissal without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to file a court-ordered amended complaint. The objection deadline passed without objections, so the district court accepted and adopted the R&R, dismissed the Complaint without prejudice, denied remaining motions as moot, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)
- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003)

OPINION

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 MILAN MICHAEL
KOTEVSKI, 4 Plaintiff, Case No.: 2:25-cv-02160-GMN-BNW 5 vs. 6 ORDER ADOPTING
REPORT AND KASH PATEL, et al., RECOMMENDATION 7 Defendants. 8 9 Pending before
the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), (ECF No. 6), 10 from United States
Magistrate Judge Brenda N. Weksler, which recommends that Plaintiff 11 Milan Michael
Kotevski’s Complaint be dismissed without prejudice for failure to file a court- 12 ordered
amended complaint.

13 A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a 14 United
States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); 15 D. Nev.
R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo 16 determination of
those portions to which objections are made if the Magistrate Judge’s findings 17 and
recommendations concern matters that may not be finally determined by a magistrate 18 judge.

D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the 19 findings
or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. 20 IB 3-
2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any 21 review at
all... of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 22 140, 149
(1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)).

Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a 23 district court is not required to review a
magistrate judge’s R&R where no objections have been 24 filed. See, e.g., *United States v. Reyna-
Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003). 25 Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to
do so has passed. (See R&R, ECF 1 || No. 6) (setting a January 13, 2026, deadline for objections).

2 Accordingly, 3 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 6),
is 4 || ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full. 5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s
Complaint is DISMISSED without 6 || prejudice. 7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all other
pending motions are DENIED as moot. 8 The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to close the case. 9
Dated this 23 day of January, 2026.

Gloria M. arro, District Judge United States’ District Court 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
25 Page 2 of 2