

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

BRIANNA P.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Docket No. 2:22-cv-00002-NT
	)	
KILOLO KIJAKAZI, Acting	)	
Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**ORDER AFFIRMING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION  
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On November 30, 2022, the United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court, with copies to the parties, his Report and Recommended Decision (ECF No. 17). The Plaintiff filed an objection to the Recommended Decision on December 14, 2022 (ECF No. 18), and the Defendant filed a response to the Plaintiff's objection on December 22, 2022 (ECF No. 20). I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in the Recommended Decision and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Defendant suggests that I should refuse to consider the Plaintiff's objection because she did not specify which of the Magistrate Judge's proposed findings or recommendations she objected to. Def.'s Resp. to Pl.'s Objs. to R. & R. 1–2 (ECF No. 20). The Plaintiff does come close to waiving *de novo* review by focusing almost entirely on the Administrative Law Judge's decision. See Objs. to R. & R. (ECF No. 18). The Magistrate Judge warned at the end of his Recommended Decision that “[a] party may file objections to those *specified portions* of a magistrate judge’s report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought.” R. & R. 6 (ECF No. 17) (emphasis added). And this Court previously admonished a litigant for “treat[ing] the Magistrate Judge’s . . . Report and Recommended Decision as

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's objection is **OVERRULED**, the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ADOPTED**, and the Commissioner's Decision is **AFFIRMED**.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Nancy Torresen  
United States District Judge

Dated this 30th day of December, 2022.

---

a nullity and ask[ing] [the Court] to review the Administrative Law Judge's decision without regard to the Magistrate Judge's analysis." *See Anna Marie W. v. Kijakazi*, No. 1:20-cv-446-DBH, 2021 WL 5304177, at \*1 (D. Me. Nov. 15, 2021). Reading the Plaintiff's objection generously, however, the Plaintiff appears to object to the finding in the Recommended Decision "that the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ's) evaluation of the medical opinion evidence of record was made in accordance with the agency's applicable regulations and supported by substantial evidence in the record." Objs. to R. & R. 1. I therefore considered her objections and made a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Recommended Decision.