

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

TYRONE ADAM WILLIAMSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

**STATE OF OREGON and MULTNOMAH
COUNTY SHERIFFS OFFICE,**

Defendants.

MOSMAN, J.,

Plaintiff Tyrone Adam Williamson instituted this action *pro se* on April 9, 2014. (Compl. [2].) Magistrate Judge Papak then issued an Order to Show Cause why the case should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Order [8].) Mr. Williamson responded. (Response [11, 13].) Upon review of the complaint and Mr. Williamson's responses, Judge Papak recommended that the suit be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

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 recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). 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 [14] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 19th day of June, 2014.

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