

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

\* \* \*

FELICIA R. YARBOROUGH,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-CV-2823 JCM (NJK)

ORDER

Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Koppe’s report and recommendation (“R&R”) in the matter of Yarborough v. Berryhill, case number 2:17-cv-02823-JCM-NJK. (ECF No. 28). No objections have been filed, and the deadline for doing so has passed.

Upon considering plaintiff’s motion for reversal and/or remand to the Social Security Administration (ECF No. 22) and the commissioner’s countermotion to affirm (ECF No. 25), Magistrate Judge Koppe concluded that the administrative law judge’s own factual findings did not comport with her ruling that plaintiff is able to engage in “light work,” pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 416.967(b). (ECF No. 28 at 9–10). Thus, Magistrate Judge Koppe recommended plaintiff’s motion to remand be granted, and the commissioner’s countermotion to affirm be denied. *Id.* at 13.

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 report 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).

