

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

James Henry Coyle v. Colette Peters

James Henry Coyle v. Colette Peters · No. 6:21-cv-149-SB · Decided April 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon reviewed a magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendation after no party filed objections. Finding no clear error, the court adopted the recommendation and granted Defendant’s motion for summary judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael H. Simon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	April 22, 2026
DOCKET	6:21-cv-149-SB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation recommending that the court grant Defendant's motion for summary judgment. No party filed objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no party objects to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendation, the district court reviews for clear error on the face of the record; de novo review is required for portions to which a timely objection is made.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies when no party objects to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendation?
2. Whether the magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation contained clear error on the face of the record.
3. Whether Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. When no party objects, the district court is not required to conduct de novo review and may review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendation for clear error on the face of the record.
2. The Findings and Recommendation contained no clear error on the face of the record and were properly adopted.
3. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment was granted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“No party having made objections, the Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record.”

“The Court ADOPTS Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 73. The Court GRANTS Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF 68.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Plaintiff James Henry Coyle's civil action against Defendant Colette Peters. The material factual record underlying the motion for summary judgment is not described in this order. The order addresses only the magistrate judge's recommendation and the absence of objections.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

United States Magistrate Judge Stacie F. Beckerman issued Findings and Recommendation on April 3, 2026, recommending that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment be granted. Because no party objected, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error on the face of the record, found none, adopted the recommendation, and granted Defendant's motion for summary judgment.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 152, 154 (1985)
- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)

OPINION

Coyle

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

JAMES HENRY COYLE, Case No. 6:21-cv-149-SB Plaintiff, ORDER v.

COLETTE PETERS,

Defendant. Michael H. Simon, District Judge. United States Magistrate Judge Stacie F. Beckerman issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on April 3, 2026. Judge Beckerman recommended that this Court grant Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF 68. No party has filed objections. Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), 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). If a party objects to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) ("There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate's report to which no objections are filed."); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review de novo magistrate judge's findings and recommendations if objection is made, "but not otherwise"). Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act "does not preclude further review by the district judge[] sua sponte . . . under a de novo or any other standard." *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recommend that "[w]hen no timely objection is filed," the court review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations for "clear error on the face of the record." No party having made objections, the Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Beckerman's Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. The Court ADOPTS Judge Beckerman's Findings and Recommendation, ECF 73. The Court GRANTS Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF 68. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 22nd day of April, 2026. /s/ Michael H. Simon Michael H. Simon United States District Judge