

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

**CHRISTON B.**<sup>1</sup>,

Plaintiff,

v.

**NANCY A. BERRYHILL**, Deputy  
Commissioner for Operations, performing the  
duties and functions not reserved to the  
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-01603-SB

**ORDER**

**Michael H. Simon, District Judge.**

United States Magistrate Judge Stacie F. Beckerman issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on November 30, 2018. ECF 23. Magistrate Judge Beckerman recommended that the Commissioner's decision be REVERSED and REMANDED for further proceedings consistent with Magistrate Judge Beckerman's opinion. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the 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). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations,

---

<sup>1</sup> In the interest of privacy, this opinion uses only the first name and the initial of the last name of the non-governmental party in this case. Where applicable, this opinion uses the same designation for a non-governmental party's immediate family member.

“the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Id.; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review de novo magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] sua sponte . . . under a de novo or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 23. The Commissioner’s decision that Plaintiff was not disabled is **REVERSED AND REMANDED** for further proceedings consistent with this Opinion and Order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 18th day of December, 2018.

/s/ Michael H. Simon  
Michael H. Simon  
United States District Judge