

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

---

OPINION

Kotevski

PER CURIAM.

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

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-nevada-united-states-district-court-for-the-district/2026/milan-michael-kotevski-v-kash-patel-et-al-d3kaoag0>