

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

AMY NGUYEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

**FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE
CORPORATION, a/k/a FREDDIE MAC;
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC;
CYPREXX SERVICES LLC,**

Defendants.

No. 3:16-cv-00316-AC

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On November 21, 2019, Magistrate Judge John V. Acosta issued his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) [ECF 96], recommending that I grant Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF 65] and that I deny Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [ECF 70]. No objections were filed.

LEGAL STANDARD

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).

CONCLUSION

Upon review of the F&R, I agree with Judge Acosta's reasoning and conclusions. Therefore, I ADOPT the F&R [96] as my own opinion. I GRANT Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [65] and I DENY Plaintiff Amy Nguyen's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [70]. This case is DISMISSED with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 17 day of December, 2019.


MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
Chief United States District Judge