

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Wesley Baugh and Cindy Baugh v. State Farm Fire and Casualty
Company, et al.

Baugh · No. CIV-25-417-RAW-JAR · Decided March 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma adopted the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation without objection. The court granted the plaintiffs’ motion to remand and remanded the action to the District Court for Pittsburg County, Oklahoma.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Ronald A. White
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	March 20, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-25-417-RAW-JAR
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending that plaintiffs' motion to remand be granted. No party filed a timely objection.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of a timely objection, the district court may review a magistrate judge's report under any standard it deems appropriate. The court found no clear error on the face of the record and adopted the recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss
- insurance

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Insurance litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to grant plaintiffs' motion to remand when no timely objection was filed.
2. Whether the action should be remanded to the District Court for Pittsburg County, Oklahoma.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court may review the magistrate judge's report and recommendation under any standard it deems appropriate; here, the court found no clear error and adopted the recommendation.
2. Plaintiffs' motion to remand is granted, and the action is remanded to the District Court for Pittsburg County, State of Oklahoma.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In the absence of a timely objection, the district court may review a magistrate’s report under any standard it deems appropriate.”” (at 2)

“there is no clear error on the face of the record.”” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion provides no substantive facts concerning the underlying insurance dispute. Plaintiffs sought remand of the action to the District Court for Pittsburg County, Oklahoma. The magistrate judge recommended granting remand, and no objection was filed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge recommended granting plaintiffs' motion to remand. After the objection period expired without objection, the district court adopted and affirmed the Report and Recommendation, granted the motion to remand, and remanded the action to the District Court for Pittsburg County, Oklahoma.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The action is remanded to the District Court for Pittsburg County, State of Oklahoma.

CASES CITED

- Summers v. Utah, 927 F.2d 1165, 1167 (10th Cir. 1991)