Doc. 18

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1

2

physician's opinion. *See Widmark v. Barnhart*, 454 F.3d 1063, 1066-67 (9th Cir. 2006) *citing Lester v. Chater*, 81 F.3d 821, 830 (9th Cir. 1996). In this case, Dr. Weiss's opinion was contradicted by that of the state agency psychologist. Tr. 77-79. Accordingly, Judge Donahue applied the correct legal standard in assessing this case. Further, for the reasons explained by Judge Donohue, this Court agrees that the ALJ provided multiple specific and legitimate reasons to discount Dr. Weiss's opinion, and therefore Plaintiff failed to demonstrate that the ALJ committed reversible error. Likewise, the Court finds that, for the reasons set forth by Judge Donohue, the ALJ provided clear and convincing reasons to discount Plaintiff's subjective testimony, and therefore the ALJ did not commit reversible error in that respect.

- (2) The final decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED and this case is dismissed with prejudice. The Court clarified that this matter is <u>not to be</u> Reversed and Remanded as Judge Donohue stated in the conclusion of his R&R. *See* Dkt. #15 at 14.
- (3) The Clerk of the Court is directed to send copies of this Order to the parties and to Judge Donohue.

DATED this 30th day of July, 2018.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE