

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
8 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**


9  
10 THOMAS M. MARSHALL, ) Case No. CV 11-1342-JST(JPR)  
11 Plaintiff, )  
12 vs. ) ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND  
13 ) RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S.  
14 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, ) MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
15 Commissioner of the Social )  
16 Security Administration, )  
17 Defendant. )

18 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the  
19 Complaint, Joint Stipulation, Administrative Record, and all  
20 other records on file, as well as the Report and Recommendation  
21 of the U.S. Magistrate Judge. On January 3, 2012, Plaintiff  
22 filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. On January  
23 11, 2012, Defendant filed a response to Plaintiff's objections.  
24 The Court has made a de novo determination of those portions of  
25 the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made.  
26 Although Plaintiff continues to assert that the Vocational  
27 Expert's testimony "deviated" from the description of a self-  
28 service laundry attendant in the Dictionary of Occupational  
Titles (see, e.g., Objections at 4), Plaintiff has never  
identified what that alleged deviation is, and the Court has not

1 identified any such variance.

2 Having reviewed the record, the Court concurs with and  
3 accepts the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. IT THEREFORE IS  
4 ORDERED that Judgment be entered denying the Complaint and  
5 dismissing this action with prejudice.

6  
7 DATED: 1/20/2012

  
8 JOSEPHINE STATON TUCKER  
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28