

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

JOHNNY RAY B.<sup>1</sup>,

Case No. 3:18-cv-00618-MK  
**ORDER**

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Defendant.

---

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Mustafa Kasubhai filed his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) (doc. 18) recommending that the final decision of the Commissioner denying plaintiff’s application benefits be affirmed. The matter is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate judge’s F&R, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the magistrate judge’s report. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), *cert denied*, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

---

<sup>1</sup> In the interest of privacy, this order uses only the first name and the initial of the last name of the non-governmental party or parties in this case.

Plaintiff has filed timely objections to the F&R (doc. 20), and the Commissioner has filed a timely response to those objections (doc. 21). Thus, I review the F&R *de novo*.

Having considered the record and the arguments offered by the parties, I find no error in Magistrate Judge Kasubhai's opinion. Thus, I adopt the F&R (doc. 18) in its entirety. Accordingly, the decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED. This action is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2019.



Ann Aiken

United States District Judge