IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PORTLAND DIVISION

FRED A. OSBORN,

No. 3:10-cv-00981-JE

Plaintiff,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

MOSMAN, J.,

On January 25, 2012, Magistrate Judge Jelderks issued his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") [20] in the above-captioned case recommending that I reverse the decision of the Commissioner and remand this action for further proceedings. No objections were filed.

DISCUSSION

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 regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or

1 – OPINION AND ORDER

recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the

court is not required to review, de novo or under 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 part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with the recommendation of Judge Jelderks and I ADOPT the F&R

[20] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 21st day of February, 2012.

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

2 – OPINION AND ORDER