

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Michelle Brooks v. Natalie H. Policorpo

Brooks · No. 2:25-cv-01681-RFB-NJK · Decided January 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada adopts in full a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation after no objections were filed. The court dismisses the case with prejudice and directs the Clerk of Court to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	January 22, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01681-RFB-NJK
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after the objection deadline expired without any objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of the objected-to portions under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). When no objections are filed, the district court is not required to conduct any review, de novo or otherwise.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the district court should accept and adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no objections were filed.

2. Whether the case should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to the magistrate judge's recommendation.

HOLDINGS

1. Because no objections were filed, the district court was not required to conduct de novo or any other review of the Report and Recommendation, and it could accept and adopt the recommendation.
2. The Report and Recommendation was accepted and adopted in full, and the case was dismissed with prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.””
(1)

“Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct “any review,” de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains no substantive factual findings concerning the underlying civil-rights dispute. The material procedural fact is that no party objected to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation by the November 26, 2025 deadline.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe issued a Report and Recommendation on November 13, 2025. Objections were due November 26, 2025, but none were filed. The district court concurred with the recommendation, accepted and adopted it in full, dismissed the case with prejudice, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)

OPINION

Brooks

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * * 7 MICHELLE BROOKS, Case No. 2:25-cv-01681-RFB-NJK 8 Plaintiff, ORDER 9 v. 10

NATALIE H. POLICORPO,

11 Defendant. 12

13 14 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 5) of the
15 Honorable Nancy J. Koppe, United States Magistrate Judge, entered on November 13, 2025. A
16 district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
recommendations 17 made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific
written objections to the 18 findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. §
636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). 19 When written objections have been filed, the district court is
required to “make a de novo 20 determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed
findings or recommendations 21 to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also
Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party 22 fails to object, however, a district court is not required to
conduct “any review,” de novo or 23 otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate
judge. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 24 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections
were due by November 26, 2025. No 25 objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the
record in this case and concurs with the 26 Magistrate Judge’s recommendation in the Report and
Recommendation. 27 /// 28 ///] IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and
Recommendation (ECF No. 5) is ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full. 3 IT IS FURTHER
ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED with prejudice. 4 The Clerk of Court is kindly instructed
to close this case accordingly. 6 DATED: January 22, 2026. ,

8 RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 _2-