

1 follows that the Court need not conduct any review of portions to which no specific
2 objection has been made. *See Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d at 1121; *see also Thomas v. Arn*, 474
3 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (discussing the inherent purpose of limited review is judicial
4 economy). Further, a party is not entitled as of right to *de novo* review of evidence or
5 arguments which are raised for the first time in an objection to the R&R, and the Court's
6 decision to consider them is discretionary. *United States v. Howell*, 231 F.3d 615, 621-622
7 (9th Cir. 2000).

8 The Court has carefully undertaken an extensive review of the sufficiently
9 developed record. Plaintiff's objections to the findings and recommendations have also
10 been thoroughly considered.

11 After conducting a *de novo* review of the issues and objections, the Court reaches
12 the same conclusions reached by the magistrate judge. The R&R will be adopted in full.
13 Accordingly,


14 **IT IS ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge Deborah M. Fine's Report and
15 Recommendation (Doc. 23) is **accepted** and **adopted** by the Court.

16 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Objections (Doc. 24) are **overruled**.

17 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the final decision of the Commissioner of the
18 Social Security Administration is **reversed and remanded for further proceedings**.

19 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** directing the Clerk of Court to enter judgment
20 accordingly and terminate this case.

21 Dated this 25th day of September, 2024.

22 
23 Honorable Steven P. Logan
24 United States District Judge
25
26
27
28