

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
ZHANG Jingrong, ZHOU Yanhua, ZHANG Peng,  
ZHANG Cuiping, WEI Min, LO Kitsuen,  
CAO Lijun, HU Yang, GUO Xiaofang,  
GAO Jinying, CUI Lina, XU Ting, BIAN Hexiang,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

Chinese Anti-Cult World Alliance (CACWA),  
Michael CHU, LI Huahong, WAN Hongjuan,  
ZHU Zirou, and DOES 1-5 Inclusive,

Defendants.  
-----X

**MEMORANDUM AND**  
**ORDER**

15cv1046 (SLT) (VMS)

**FILED**  
IN CLERK'S OFFICE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.  
★ MAR 22 2016 ★  
**BROOKLYN OFFICE**

**TOWNES, United States District Judge:**

On March 3, 2015, Plaintiffs commenced this action by filing a Complaint against Defendants alleging conspiracy to violate civil rights and to prevent authorities from providing full, free, equal access to public spaces in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3), interference with religious freedom in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 248, bias related violence and intimidation in violation of N.Y. Civ. Rights L. § 79-n, and asserting certain common law claims. (ECF No. 2.) All Defendants, except DOES 1-5, have moved for partial dismissal of the Complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 12(b)(6). (ECF No. 27.) By order dated August 27, 2015 (ECF No. 31), this Court referred Defendants' motion to Magistrate Vera M. Scanlon ("Judge Scanlon") for a report and recommendation ("R&R").

On January 28, 2016, Judge Scanlon electronically filed and served her R&R in which she recommended that Defendants' motion be denied in its entirety and that any objections to the R&R were due by February 11, 2016. (ECF No. 35.) To date, no objections have been filed and no party has requested an extension of time in which to do so.

A district court is not required to review the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of a report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Even when no objections are filed, however,

many courts seek to satisfy themselves “that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee note (1983 Addition); *see also Edwards v. Town of Huntington*, No. 05 Civ. 339 (NGG) (AKT), 2007 WL 2027913, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. July 11, 2007).

Although not required to do so, this Court has reviewed Judge Scanlon’s R&R for clear error on the face of the record. The Court finds no clear error, and therefore adopts the R&R in its entirety as the opinion of the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Judge Scalon’s Report and Recommendation dated January 28, 2016, recommending that Defendants’ motion be denied and that this matter be remanded for further development of the record, is adopted in its entirety.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Sandra L. Townes  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SANDRA L. TOWNES  
United States District Judge

Dated: March 17, 2016  
Brooklyn, New York