## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

JEAN LANGDON,

Plaintiff,

No. 3:15-cv-01342-PK

v.

OPINION AND ORDER

CAROLYN W. COLVIN Commissioner, Social Security Administration,

Defendants.

## HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Paul Papak issued a Findings & Recommendation [18] on September 6, 2016, recommending that the Commissioner of Social Security's decision be reversed and the case remanded for the immediate payment of benefits. Defendant has timely filed objections [20] 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).

1 – ORDER

When a 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); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 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 Defendant'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 errors in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Papak's Findings & Recommendation [18], and therefore, the Commissioner's final decision is REVERSED and this case is REMANDED for an immediate award of benefits.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

United States District Judge