UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

ERIC WATSON, et al., Plaintiffs, v. ROY PECK et al., Defendants.	CASE NO. C24-6007 BHS ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Magistrate Judge David W. Christel's Report and Recommendation (R&R), Dkt. 7, recommending the Court transfer this real estate contract dispute to Arizona, where the subject real property and the defendants are located, and where venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

A district court "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed finding or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) (emphasis added); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). It must modify or set aside any portion of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

The Court must "review the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise." *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing § 636(b)(1)(C)). A proper objection requires "specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2).

Plaintiffs Eric and Sarah Watson have not objected to the R&R, and its recommended transfer of this matter to the District of Arizona is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. It is instead plainly correct. 42 U.S.C. § 1391(b). The R&R is therefore **ADOPTED**, and the clerk shall **TRANSFER** this case to the United States District Court for the District of Arizona.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 24th day of January, 2025.

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
United States District Judge