

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

Khidja Johnson,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 1:18-cv-1552-MLB

American Family Insurance a/k/a
American Family Mutual
Insurance Company, American
Family Life Insurance Company,
and American Standard Insurance
Company of Wisconsin,

Defendants.

_____/


ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Christopher C. Bly's Final Report and Recommendation ("R&R"). (Dkt. 166.) The R&R recommends granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 139) and denying Defendants' Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. 142). Plaintiff failed to respond to Defendants' motions, or file objections to the R&R, despite several extensions of the deadlines to do so. (*See* Dkts. 166 at 4–7; 171; 188.) Defendants filed no objections either.

“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). But many district courts still do conduct a limited review of unobjected-to portions of an R&R, typically for clear error. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee’s note (1983 Addition) (“When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”). Even assuming that review is necessary here, the Court sees no clear error in the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions. So the Court adopts the R&R, grants Defendants’ summary judgment motion, and denies Defendants’ motion for sanctions.

The Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Final Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 166), **GRANTS** Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 139), and **DENIES** Defendants’ Motion for Sanctions (Dkt. 142).

SO ORDERED this 24th day of September, 2021.



MICHAEL L. BROWN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE