

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

TAHISHA DAWSON,

Plaintiff,

- against -

PELICAN MANAGEMENT, INC., SERGEANT
HECTOR, and LIEUTENANT PERVIS,

Defendants.

-----X

MATSUMOTO, United States District Judge:

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

11-CV-1753 (KAM)(LB)

On April 8, 2011, Tahisha Dawson ("plaintiff") commenced this action *pro se* against her former employer, Pelican Management, Inc., alleging gender discrimination, failure to accommodate her disability, and retaliation. (*See generally* ECF No. 1, Complaint.) On September 20, 2011, less than one month before the deadline for completing discovery, counsel appeared on plaintiff's behalf. (*See* ECF No. 15, Notice of Appearance.) On October 3, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion to amend her complaint (*see* ECF No. 17, Motion to Amend), which the Honorable Magistrate Judge Lois Bloom granted in part and denied in part (*see* ECF No. 22, Order dated 10/28/2011). Plaintiff's amended complaint added claims under the New York City Human Rights Law and added Sergeant Hector and Lieutenant Pervis as defendants. (ECF No. 23, Amended Complaint.)

On May 8, 2012, plaintiff filed a second motion to amend, seeking to add claims for unpaid wages on behalf of

herself and all others similarly situated under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.* and the New York Labor Law. (ECF No. 27, Second Motion to Amend.) Presently before the court is a Report and Recommendation issued by Judge Bloom on June 1, 2012, recommending that this court deny plaintiff's motion to amend. (ECF No. 39, Report and Recommendation.)

As explicitly noted at the end of the Report and Recommendation, any written objections to the Report and Recommendation were to be filed within fourteen (14) days of service of the Report and Recommendation. (Report and Recommendation at 8); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Accordingly, any objections to the Report and Recommendation were due by June 15, 2012. The statutory period for filing objections has now expired, and no objections to Magistrate Judge Bloom's Report and Recommendation have been filed.

In reviewing a Report and Recommendation, the district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Where no objection to the Report and Recommendation has been filed, the district court "need only satisfy itself that that there is no clear error on the face of the record." *Urena v. New York*, 160 F. Supp. 2d 606, 609-10 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (quoting *Nelson v. Smith*, 618 F. Supp. 1186, 1189

(S.D.N.Y. 1985)).

Upon a review of the Report and Recommendation, and considering that the parties have failed to object to any of Magistrate Judge Bloom's thorough and well-reasoned recommendations, the court finds no clear error in Magistrate Judge Bloom's Report and Recommendation and hereby affirms and adopts the Report and Recommendation as the opinion of the court.

The parties are directed to file any request for a pre-motion conference within two weeks of the date of this Memorandum and Order.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 19, 2012
Brooklyn, New York

_____/s/_____
Kiyoko A. Matsumoto
United States District Judge