

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

MICHAEL J. GALE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 3:18-cv-00707-AC

ORDER

SAIF CORPORATION; MELISSA PIERCE,
Claims Adjuster for SAIF; TIA
LAFONTAINE, Claims Adjuster for SAIF;
BROWN TRANSFER, INC.;
TANASBOURNE PLASTIC SURGERY;
SHELDON R. COBER, M.D.;
PROVIDENCE OCCUPATIONAL
HEALTH HILLSBORO; BEAVERTON
ARMWORKS HAND THERAPY, LLC,

Defendants.

HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Acosta issued a Findings and Recommendation [105] on January 3, 2020, in which he recommends that the Court should grant in part Defendants' motions to dismiss Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint [88]. Plaintiff timely filed objections to the Findings and Recommendation. The matter is now before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings and 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); 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).


The Court has carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and concludes that the objections do not provide a basis to modify the Findings and Recommendation. The Court has also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record de novo and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Acosta's Findings and Recommendation [105]. Therefore, Defendant's Motions to Dismiss [90, 91, 92, 93, 96] are GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 16, 2020.



MARCO A. HERNÁNDEZ
United States District Judge