Fanlo v. Berr	yhill	D	oc. 26
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	JON PAUL FANLO,	Case No.: 17cv1617-LAB (BLM)	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING REPORT	
13	V.	AND RECOMMENDATION; AND	
14	NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting	ORDER AWARDING	
15	Comm'r of Social Security, Defendant.	ATTORNEY'S FEES	
16			
17			

Judge Major issued her report and recommendation (the "R&R"), which recommended an award of attorney's fees and expenses pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA), and costs as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 1920. No objections to the R&R were filed.

A district court has jurisdiction to review a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation on dispositive matters. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). "The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." *Id.* "A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This section does not require some lesser review by

the district court when no objections are filed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149– 50 (1985). The "statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise." *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (emphasis in original).

The Court has reviewed the R&R, finds it to be correct, and **ADOPTS** it. The joint motion for fees (Docket no. 24) is **GRANTED**. The Court awards \$3,617.77 under the EAJA, and no costs under 28 U.S.C. § 1920, to be paid subject to the terms of the joint motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 20, 2020

Hon. Larry Alan Burns United States District Judge