

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

## PORTLAND DIVISION

**BRAEDEN BURGE by and through his  
guardian ad litem KELLY BURGE,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**COLTON SCHOOL DISTRICT 53,**

Defendant.

**MOSMAN, J.,**

On July 2, 2015, Magistrate Judge Stewart issued her Findings and Recommendation (F&R) [41], recommending that Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney Fees and Costs [31] should be GRANTED and that Plaintiff should be awarded his attorney fees in the reduced sum of \$64,925.20 and his costs in the amount of \$1,350.00. No objections to the Findings and Recommendation were filed.

**DISCUSSION**

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, *de novo* or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See*

*Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Stewart's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [41] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 21st day of July, 2015.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman  
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN  
United States District Judge