

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Luis Taylor v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

Taylor · No. 2:25-cv-00303-GMN-MDC · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada adopted in full a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation because no objections were filed by the deadline. The court granted Plaintiff Luis Taylor’s unopposed motion for attorneys’ fees in his Social Security case against Commissioner Frank Bisignano.

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	December 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00303-GMN-MDC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending that the plaintiff's unopposed motion for attorneys' fees be granted.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When objections are filed to matters not finally determinable by a magistrate judge, the district court conducts de novo review of the objected-to portions and may accept, reject, or modify the recommendation. When no objections are filed, the district court is not required to conduct any review of issues not subject to objection.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Luis Taylor v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- attorney fees
- civil procedure
- administrative law

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- Social Security
- attorneys' fees

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review and adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no objections were filed.
2. Whether the unopposed motion for attorneys' fees should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. Because no objections were filed and the objection deadline had passed, the district court accepted and adopted the Report and Recommendation in full.
2. The unopposed motion for attorneys' fees was granted.

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 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Taylor filed an unopposed motion for attorneys' fees in the underlying Social Security matter. The magistrate judge recommended granting the motion. No objections to the Report and Recommendation were filed, and the objection deadline expired.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Maximiliano D. Couvillier, III issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that Taylor's unopposed motion for attorneys' fees be granted. No party filed objections before the November 27, 2025 deadline. The district court accepted and adopted the Report and Recommendation in full and granted the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

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

Taylor

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3

LUIS TAYLOR,

4 Plaintiff, Case No.: 2:25-cv-00303-GMN-MDC 5 vs.

6 ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND

FRANK BISIGNANO, RECOMMENDATION

7 Commissioner of Social Security 8 Defendant. 9 Pending before the Court is the Report and
Recommendation (“R&R”), (ECF No. 21), 10 from United States Magistrate Judge Maximiliano
D. Couvillier, III, which recommends 11 granting the Unopposed Motion for Attorneys’ Fees,
(ECF No. 19), filed by Plaintiff Luis 12 Taylor. 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 21) (setting a November 27, 2025 deadline for objections). 2 3
Accordingly, 4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 21),
is 5 ||} ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full. 6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Unopposed
Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, (ECF 7 || No. 19), is GRANTED. 8 Dated this 3 day of December,
2025. 10 yy Te Gloria M. Ka} 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