

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

JULIE TAYLOR-SHELTON,  
Plaintiff,

Case 6:17-cv-01195-MK  
**ORDER**

v.

CREDIT ASSOCIATES, INC.,  
Defendant.

---

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Thomas Coffin filed his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (doc. 33) recommending that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgement and Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgement be denied. Defendant then timely filed objections to the F&R (doc. 35). 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). Based on my review of the F&R and the documents in the case, I find no error in Judge Coffin's F&R and Defendant's objections do not undermine Judge Coffin's analysis. Thus, I adopt Judge Coffin's F&R (doc. 33) in its entirety. Accordingly, Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgement (doc. 21) and Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgement (doc. 25) are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 25<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2019.



---

Ann Aiken  
United States District Judge