

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

ROBERTA F. MILLER,

Plaintiff,

No. 3:12-cv-01222-AC

v.

ORDER

CITY OF PORTLAND, *et al.*,

Defendants.

HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge John V. Acosta issued a Findings & Recommendation [52] on June 10, 2014, recommending that Plaintiff Roberta Miller's Motion for Attorney Fees [40] be denied. Plaintiff has timely filed objections to the Findings & Recommendation. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the

Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).


I have carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and conclude there is no basis to modify the Findings & Recommendation. I have also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and find no other errors in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Acosta's Findings & Recommendation [52], and therefore, Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney Fees [40] is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 18 day of Aug, 2014.


MARCO A. HERNÁNDEZ
United States District Judge