

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

KIERA S.,¹

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. 6:17-cv-1082-SU

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on August 16, 2018. ECF 14. Judge Sullivan recommended that the Commissioner's decision be reversed and remanded. 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,

¹ In the interest of privacy, this Order uses only the first name and the first initial of the last name for non-governmental parties.

“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 Judge Sullivan’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Judge Sullivan’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 14. The Commissioner’s decision is **REVERSED** and **REMANDED** for further proceedings in accordance with this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 7th day of September, 2018.

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