

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.

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