Dalsanto v. Berryhill

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

DENNIS M. DALSANTO,

**Plaintiff** 

v.

3

4

5

6

7

8

NANCY A. BERRYHILL,

Defendant

Case No.: 2:17-cv-02157-APG-VCF

**Order Accepting Report and** Recommendation, Denying Motion for **Summary Judgment, and Granting Motion** to Affirm

[ECF Nos. 18, 19, 24]

On December 17, 2019, Magistrate Judge Ferenbach recommended that I deny plaintiff Dennis Dalsanto's motion for remand and grant the defendant's motion for summary judgment. 10 ECF No. 24. Dalsanto did not file an objection. Thus, I am not obligated to conduct a de novo  $11\parallel$ review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring district courts to 12 "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings to 13 which objection is made"); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) 14 (en banc) ("the district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations 15 de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise" (emphasis in original)).

I THEREFORE ORDER that Magistrate Judge Ferenbach's report and recommendation 17 (ECF No. 24) is accepted, plaintiff Dennis Dalsanto's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 18 18 is **DENIED**, and defendant Nancy A. Berryhill's motion to affirm (**ECF No. 19**) is **GRANTED**. The clerk of court is instructed to enter judgment in favor of the defendant and 20 against the plaintiff, and to close this case.

DATED this 9th day of January, 2020.

22

21

16

23

ANDREW P. GORDON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE