

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

SYLVIA ROLLINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 2:11-cv-03056-SU

OPINION AND ORDER

**MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner,
Social Security Administration,**

Defendant.

MOSMAN, J.,

On March 6, 2012, Magistrate Judge Sullivan issued her Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) [15] in the above-captioned case recommending that I affirm the Commissioner’s decision and dismiss this case. Neither party filed objections.

BACKGROUND

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions

of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

CONCLUSION

Upon review, I agree with Judge Sullivan's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [15] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 30th day of March, 2012.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Court