

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Jessica Vo v. Meta Platforms, Inc.

Vo · No. 3:25-cv-01602-JR · Decided May 15, 2026

OPINION

Vo

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

JESSICA VO, Case No.: 3:25-cv-01602-JR Plaintiff, v.

ORDER

META PLATFORMS, INC.,

Defendant. Adrienne Nelson, District Judge: United States Magistrate Judge Jolie A. Russo issued a findings and recommendation (“F&R”) in this employment discrimination action on April 20, 2026, ECF 29. The F&R recommends that defendant Meta Platforms Inc.’s motion to compel arbitration should be granted. F&R 1. No party has filed objections, which were due by May 4, 2026. Id. at 13. The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). A district court judge may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). No standard of review is prescribed for portions for the report for which no objections are filed, and no review is required in the absence of objections. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152-54 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 382 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). A district judge is not, however, precluded from reviewing the report sua sponte under a de novo, or any other, standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154; *Decker v. Berryhill*, 856 F.3d 659, 663 (9th Cir. 2017). Courts in this district have followed the Advisory Committee’s recommendation that, when no timely objection is filed, findings and recommendations be reviewed for “clear error on the face of the record.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee’s note to 1983 amendment; see, e.g., *Hayden v. United States*, 147 F. Supp. 3d 1125, 1127 (D. Or. 2015) (following the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviewing magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record”). Because no party in this case has made objections to the F&R, the Court reviews the F&R for clear error on the face of the record. Finding no such error, the Court ADOPTS the F&R, ECF 29. Defendant’s motion to compel arbitration, ECF 18, is granted accordingly. Defendant’s motion to stay discovery pending resolution of the motion to compel arbitration, ECF 25, is denied as moot.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court ADOPTS the Findings and Recommendations, ECF 29.

Defendant's Motion to Compel Arbitration, ECF 18, is GRANTED and Defendant's Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Resolution of the Motion to Compel Arbitration, ECF 25, is DENIED as moot. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 15th day of May, 2026. . United States District Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-oregon/2026/jessica-vo-v-meta-platforms-inc-segmn920>