

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Judge Philip A. Brimmer

Civil Action No. 25-cv-03720-PAB-NRN

IAN HAUMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

HIGHLAND BRIDGE LOFTS HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER ACCEPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court on the Recommendation of Magistrate Judge [Docket No. 38]. The Recommendation states that objections to the Recommendation must be filed within fourteen days after its service on the parties. Docket No. 38 at 13; *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The Recommendation was served on July 17, 2026. No party has objected to the Recommendation.

In the absence of an objection, the district court may review a magistrate judge's recommendation under any standard it deems appropriate. *See Summers v. Utah*, 927 F.2d 1165, 1167 (10th Cir. 1991); *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) ("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."). In this matter, the Court has reviewed the Recommendation

to satisfy itself that there is “no clear error on the face of the record.”¹ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), Advisory Committee Notes. Based on this review, the Court has concluded that the Recommendation is a correct application of the facts and the law. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Recommendation of Magistrate Judge [Docket No. 38] is **ACCEPTED**. It is further

ORDERED that defendant’s Motion to Stay and Compel ADR [Docket No. 2] is **GRANTED**. It is further

ORDERED that this matter is **STAYED** pending the parties’ mediation and, if unsuccessful, arbitration of this dispute. It is further

ORDERED that the parties are compelled to mediate and, if unsuccessful, arbitrate this dispute. Defendant is put on notice that a failure by the defendant to participate in good faith in the mediation or arbitration process could be considered either a waiver or default of the right to arbitrate and may lead to the lifting of the stay in this case.

DATED August 3, 2026.

BY THE COURT:



PHILIP A. BRIMMER
United States District Judge

¹ This standard of review is something less than a “clearly erroneous” or “contrary to law” standard of review, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), which in turn is less than a de novo review. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).