

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  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

ANNETTE WALKER-GOGGINS,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:15-CV-1839 JCM (CWH)

ORDER

Presently before the court are the report and recommendation of Magistrate Judge Hoffman. (ECF No. 8). Pro se plaintiff Annette Walker-Goggins filed an “appeal/ bound over to Supreme Court” which was docketed as an objection to the report and recommendation. (ECF No. 11).

Magistrate Judge Hoffman recommended that plaintiff be allowed to proceed in forma pauperis but that defendant’s complaint be dismissed with prejudice. Magistrate Judge Hoffman found that plaintiff’s complaint contains “incoherent, fanciful, and delusional claims and descriptions [that] do not state a claim upon which relief can be granted.” (ECF No. 8).

Plaintiff’s “objection” does not object to any of the magistrate judge’s findings. Plaintiff simply lists “appealed” next to the motions that Magistrate Judge Hoffman recommends denying after concluding that plaintiff’s complaint is frivolous. (ECF. No. 11).

This court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge’s **findings and recommendation**, then the court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the [**report and recommendation**] to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

