



Glock, Inc. v. Polymer80, Inc.

2024 | Cited 0 times | D. Nevada | March 5, 2024

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

*** GLOCK, INC.,

Plaintiff, v. POLYMER80, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-00086-MMD-CLB

ORDER

Plaintiff Glock, Inc. sued Defendant Polymer80, Inc. for alleged patent infringement. (ECF No. 1.) Before the Court is United States Magistrate Judge Carla L. Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 55), recommending that the Court a default against it because Defendant has not retained counsel after prior counsel was permitted to withdraw despite several orders to do so. Objections to the R&R were due February 29, 2024. (Id.) To date, no objections to the R&R have been filed. For this reason, and as further explained below, the Court adopts the R&R in full.

Because there was no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is satisfied that Judge Baldwin did not clearly err. See *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 recommendations is required if, but only if, one or both parties file objections to the

(emphasis in original). on the well-settled principle that corporations may not proceed pro se. (ECF No. 55.)

Judge Baldwin did not clearly err.

It is therefore ordered that the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Carla L. Baldwin (ECF No. 55) is accepted and adopted in full.

It is further ordered that Defendant answer (ECF No. 25) is stricken. It is further ordered that Defendant has defaulted by reason of its failure to under Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a).



Glock, Inc. v. Polymer80, Inc.

2024 | Cited 0 times | D. Nevada | March 5, 2024

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter .

It is further ordered that Plaintiff may file a motion for default judgment within 30 days of entry of this order.

DATED THIS 5 th

Day of March 2024.

MIRANDA M. DU CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

