

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Tatiana Hamilton v. Tricon Residential, et al.

Hamilton · No. 2:25-cv-02504-GMN-BNW · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of Tatiana Hamilton’s complaint with prejudice. The court denied Hamilton’s motion to conceal or seal the case, holding that she failed to overcome the First Amendment right of public access, and directed 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 8, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02504-GMN-BNW
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice. Plaintiff filed no objections to the R&R but filed a motion to conceal the case, which the court construed as a motion to seal the case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's R&R, the district court is not required to conduct review of issues not subject to objection. If objections are filed to matters that may not be finally determined by a magistrate judge, the district court must conduct de novo review of the objected-to portions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is not identified in the source.
PARTIES	Tatiana Hamilton v. Tricon Residential, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- first amendment
- pleadings
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Constitutional law

Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to review the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when Plaintiff filed no objections.
2. Whether Plaintiff's motion to conceal, construed as a motion to seal the case, should be granted.
3. Whether Plaintiff's asserted lack of consent to civil or federal jurisdiction provided a basis to seal the entire docket.

HOLDINGS

1. Because Plaintiff filed no objections to the R&R, the district court was not required to conduct review of issues not made the subject of an objection and accepted and adopted the R&R in full.
2. The motion to conceal, construed as a motion to seal the case, was denied because Plaintiff supplied no supporting authority and did not overcome the First Amendment right of public access to court dockets.
3. Plaintiff's assertion that she did not consent to civil or federal jurisdiction did not provide a basis to seal the entire docket because she consented to the court's jurisdiction by filing the 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.”” (1)

“Plaintiff does not overcome this right because the remedy of sealing the entire docket is not narrowly tailored to achieving the goal of protecting information related to a “private equity matter.”” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a federal Complaint against Tricon Residential and other defendants. After the magistrate judge recommended dismissal with prejudice, Plaintiff did not file objections by the deadline. Plaintiff filed a motion seeking to conceal the case from public platforms, asserting that it was a private equity matter and that she did not consent to civil or federal jurisdiction.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Brenda N. Weksler issued an R&R recommending dismissal with prejudice and set January 2, 2026, as the deadline for objections. No objections were filed. Plaintiff instead moved to conceal the case from public platforms, and the district court denied that motion, adopted the R&R in full, dismissed the Complaint with prejudice, 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)
- United States v. Doe, 870 F.3d 991, 997 (9th Cir. 2017)
- S.E.C. v. Ross, 504 F.3d 1130, 1149 (9th Cir. 2007)

OPINION

Hamilton

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3

TATIANA HAMILTON,

4 Plaintiff, Case No.: 2:25-cv-02504-GMN-BNW 5 vs.

6 ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND

TRICON RESIDENTIAL, et al., RECOMMENDATION

7 Defendants. 8

9 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), (ECF No. 3), 10 from United States Magistrate Brenda N. Weksler, which recommends that Plaintiff Tatiana 11 Hamilton’s Complaint be dismissed with prejudice. 12 A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a 13 United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); 14 D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo 15 determination of those portions to which objections are made if the Magistrate Judge’s findings 16 and recommendations concern matters that may not be finally determined by a magistrate 17 judge. D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the 18 findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. 19 IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any 20 review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 21 140, 149 (1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a 22 district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s R&R where no objections have been 23 filed. See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003). 24 Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. (See R&R, ECF

25 No. 3) (setting a January 2, 2026, deadline for objections). Plaintiff only filed a Motion to

1 Conceal Case, (ECF No. 5), which the Court construes as a Motion to Seal the case.¹ Plaintiff 2 moves the Court to conceal the case from all public platforms because the case is a “private 3 equity matter” and Plaintiff does not “consent[] to any civil or federal jurisdiction.” (Mot.

4 Conceal 2:9–12, ECF No. 5). Plaintiff fails to provide any authority for her motion, which

5 alone is fatal to her request. LR 7-2(d) (“The failure of a moving party to file points and 6
authorities in support of the motion constitutes a consent to the denial of the motion.”). But 7
beyond this deficiency, Plaintiff does not overcome the First Amendment right of public access 8
to the case docket because (1) court’s dockets have historically been open to the press and 9
general public; and (2) public access plays a positive role in the function of preserving case 10
records. See *United States v. Doe*, 870 F.3d 991, 997 (9th Cir. 2017). Plaintiff does not 11
overcome this right because the remedy of sealing the entire docket is not narrowly tailored to 12
achieving the goal of protecting information related to a “private equity matter.” Moreover, 13
Plaintiff consented to the Court’s jurisdiction when she filed her Complaint, see *S.E.C. v. Ross*, 14
504 F.3d 1130, 1149 (9th Cir. 2007), so this does not form a basis to seal the entire docket. 15
Accordingly, 16 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 3),
is 17 ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full. 18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion
to Conceal the Case, (ECF No. 19 5), is DENIED. 20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s
Complaint is DISMISSED with 21 prejudice. 22 /// 23 /// 24 /// 25 1 Nothing in the Motion to
Conceal can be construed as an objection to the R&R. 1 The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to
close the case. 2 Dated this 8 day of January, 2026. Yj, Hr. Gloria M. Nayarro, District Judge 4
United Sta □□ District Court 5 6 7 8 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Page 3 of
3