

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
MARTINSBURG**

**LUIS PEREZ,**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**Civil Action No. 3:06-CV-88  
(Judge Bailey)**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

**Respondent.**

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert [Doc. No. 4] dated July 3, 2007, to which neither party filed objections. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, failure to file objections to the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation permits the District Court to review the recommendation under the standards that the District Court believes are appropriate, and under these circumstances, the parties' right to *de novo* review is waived. **See *Webb v. Califano***, 468 F. Supp. 825 (E.D. Cal. 1979).

Accordingly, because no objections have been filed, this report and recommendation ("R & R") will be reviewed for clear error. Upon review of the R & R and the record, it is the opinion of this Court that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 4] should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED**.


For reasons more fully stated in the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert [Doc. No. 4], this Court **ORDERS** that plaintiff's Motion

to Vacate [Doc. No. 1] be **DENIED** and the case be **DISMISSED** from the docket.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit true copies of this Order to all counsel of record.

**DATED:** October 2, 2007.



**JOHN PRESTON BAILEY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**