Shirley v. Manning et al Doc. 35

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PORTLAND DIVISION

SCOTT SHIRLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

MR. MANNING, JOHN DOE, and THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants.

No. 3:13-cv-00236-PK

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On January 17, 2014, Magistrate Judge Papak issued his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") [33] in the above-captioned case, recommending that Defendant Manning's Motion for Summary Judgment [20] be GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. Plaintiff did not object to the F&R.

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

Dockets.Justia.com

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 Judge Papak's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R [33] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 5th day of February, 2014.

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