

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Luis Enrique Ramos Perez v. Evolet's Painting Service LLC, et al.

Perez · No. CV-25-01886-PHX-SMM (ASB) · Decided April 20, 2026

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA Luis Enrique Ramos Perez, NO. CV-25-01886-PHX-SMM (ASB) Plaintiff, ORDER v. Evolet's Painting Service LLC, et al., Defendants. This matter was assigned to Magistrate Judge Alison S. Bachus. (Doc. 6).

On April 16, 2026, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) with this Court. The Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court denies Plaintiff’s Motion for Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Against All Defendants with leave to amend.

To date, no objections have been filed. This case is assigned to a Magistrate Judge. However, not all parties have consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge. Thus, the matter is before this Court pursuant to General Order 21-25, which states in relevant part: When a United States Magistrate Judge to whom a civil action has been assigned pursuant to Local Rule 3.7(a)(1) considers dismissal to be appropriate but lacks the jurisdiction to do so under U.S.C. § 636(c)(1) due to incomplete status of election by the parties to consent or not consent to the full authority of the Magistrate Judge, IT IS ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge will prepare a Report and Recommendation for the Chief United States District Judge or designee.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED designating the following District Court Judges to review and, if deemed suitable, to sign the order of dismissal on my behalf: Phoenix/Prescott: Senior United States District Judge Stephen M. McNamee I STANDARD OF REVIEW 2 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or || recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see □□□□□□ □□□ 4] Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir.

1991). Parties have fourteen days from the service 5|| of a copy of the Magistrate’s recommendation within which to file specific written 6|| objections to the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6, 72. Failure to object to a 7|| Magistrate Judge’s recommendation relieves the Court of conducting de novo review of 8 || the Magistrate Judge’s factual findings and waives all objections to those findings on 9|| appeal.

See Turner v. Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998). A failure to object to a || Magistrate Judge’s conclusion “is a factor to be weighed in considering the propriety of 11 || finding waiver

of an issue on appeal.” Id. 12 DISCUSSION? 13 Having reviewed the R&R of the Magistrate Judge, and no Objections having been || made by any party thereto, the Court hereby incorporates and adopts the R&R.

15 CONCLUSION 16 Accordingly, 17 IT IS ORDERED adopting the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate || Judge denying Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs. (Doc. 18). 19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and || Costs without prejudice and granting leave to re-file. (Doc. 16). 21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff may file an amended motion for attorneys' fees and costs on or before May 15, 2026 pursuant to LRCiv 54.2.

23 Dated this 20th day of April, 2026. oe 25 Stephen M. McNamee 6 Senior United States District Judge 27 || 2 The factual and procedural history of this case is set forth in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 18). -2-