

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

OPINION

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