

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

ROBYN L. SUMMIT,

Case No. 6:16-cv-01193-SU
ORDER

Plaintiff,

vs.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Sullivan filed her Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") on 7/13/2017 (doc. 20). 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).

Plaintiff filed timely objections to the F&R (doc. 25), and the Commissioner has filed a response (doc. 26). Thus, I review the F&R *de novo*.

I find no error and concur with Magistrate Judge Sullivan's thorough analysis of the factual and legal issues in this case.

Therefore, I adopt Magistrate Judge Sullivan's F&R (doc. 20) in its entirety. The decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED, and this case is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 24th day of August, 201~~6~~⁷.



Ann Aiken
United States District Judge