

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Jermel Arcilicia Taylor v. Karin Immergut

Taylor · No. 2:25-cv-01685-HL · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon adopted a magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendation recommending dismissal of Plaintiff’s Complaint without prejudice. Because no timely objections were filed, the court found no error and dismissed the Complaint without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Baggio, District Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01685-HL
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation recommending dismissal of the complaint without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Because no timely objections were filed, de novo review of the record was not required under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). The court nevertheless reviewed the legal principles de novo and found no error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal magistrate judge review
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to conduct de novo review of the magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation when no timely objections were filed.
2. Whether the court should adopt the Findings and Recommendation and dismiss the Complaint without prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court is relieved of its obligation to review the record de novo.
2. The court adopted Magistrate Judge Hallman's Findings and Recommendation and dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because no objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendation were timely filed, the Court is relieved of its obligation to review the record de novo.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains no substantive factual background concerning the underlying claims. It addresses only the procedural disposition of Plaintiff's Complaint following a magistrate judge's recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Hallman issued Findings and Recommendation on November 17, 2025, recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's Complaint without prejudice. No timely objections were filed. The district court adopted the Findings and Recommendation and dismissed the Complaint without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON JERMEL ARCILICIA TAYLOR, Case No. 2:25-cv-01685-HL Plaintiff, ORDER v. KARIN IMMERGUT, Defendant. BAGGIO, District Judge: Magistrate Judge Hallman issued a Findings and Recommendation on November 17, 2025, in which he recommends that the Court dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint without prejudice. F&R, ECF No. 14.

The matter is now before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Because no objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendation

were timely filed, the Court is relieved of its obligation to review the record de novo. *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding de novo review required only for portions of Magistrate Judge's report to which objections have been made).

Having reviewed the legal principles de novo, the Court finds no error. **CONCLUSION** The Court adopts Magistrate Judge Hallman's Findings and Recommendation [14]. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Complaint [1] is dismissed without prejudice. **IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED** this 10th day of December, 2025. **wn 4 United States District Judge 2 — ORDER**