

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

----oo0oo----

WAYNE WOFFORD,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

 Defendant.

No. 2:19-CV-0792 WBS DMC

ORDER

----oo0oo----

Plaintiff, who is proceeding with retained counsel, brings this action for judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Eastern District of California local rules.

On February 26, 2021, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice that the parties may file objections within the time specified therein. Timely objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed.

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §
2 636(b) (1) (C) and Local Rule 304(f), this court has conducted a de
3 novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire
4 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be
5 supported by the record and by proper analysis.

6 Specifically, the court finds that the Commissioner's
7 decision was based on properly legal standards and supported by
8 substantial evidence in the record as a whole. See Tacket v.
9 Apfel, 180 F.3d 1094, 1097 (9th Cir. 1999). In doing so, the
10 court agrees with the magistrate judge's findings, among others,
11 that (1) the administrative law judge ("ALJ") properly determined
12 plaintiff's residual capacity functioning in connection with his
13 visual impairment; (2) plaintiff's ability to work for many years
14 was a proper factor to consider in assessing disability, given
15 the ALJ's recognition of plaintiff's lifetime of visual
16 impairments since age two; (3) plaintiff's Global Assessment of
17 Functioning ("GAF") score in February 2016 did not indicate
18 worsening mental impairments, given the limitation of this
19 assessment and the improvements he showed with counseling; (4)
20 the ALJ did in fact account for Dr. Izzi's opinion that plaintiff
21 was moderately limited in his ability to be supervised; and (5)
22 the ALJ properly discounted the testimony of plaintiff and his
23 mother regarding the severity of his symptoms in light of the
24 objective medical evidence and his daily activities.

25 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 26 1. The findings and recommendations filed February
27 26, 2021, are adopted in full;
- 28 2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Docket

1 No. 17) is denied;

2 3. Defendant's cross-motion for summary judgment
3 (Docket No. 18) is granted;

4 4. The Commissioner's final decision is affirmed; and

5 5. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter
6 judgment and close this file.

7 Dated: April 15, 2021



8 WILLIAM B. SHUBB
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28