

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Tiana Dannella Sara B. v. Frank Bisignano

Tiana Dannella Sara B. · No. 2:24-cv-05590-FWS-JC · Decided July 28, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California accepted the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation in a Social Security disability benefits action. After conducting de novo review of the plaintiff’s objections, the court overruled them, affirmed the Commissioner’s decision, denied remand, and dismissed the action with prejudice. Judgment was directed to be entered accordingly.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Fred W. Slaughter
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 28, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-05590-FWS-JC
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the denial of Social Security disability benefits. After the magistrate judge issued a report and recommendation recommending affirmance of the Commissioner’s decision and dismissal with prejudice, Plaintiff objected. The district court conducted de novo review of the objections, overruled them, adopted the report and recommendation, affirmed the Commissioner’s decision, denied remand, and dismissed the action with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation to which specific objections were made, under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3). The underlying administrative decision was reviewed under the applicable Social Security judicial-review standards.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court opinion with no reporter citation in the source

PARTIES

Tiana Dannella Sara B. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

agency adjudication

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should sustain Plaintiff's objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation after conducting de novo review.
2. Whether the Commissioner's denial of Social Security disability benefits should be affirmed or remanded based on Plaintiff's contention that the ALJ committed harmful error.

HOLDINGS

1. A district judge must conduct de novo review of the portions of a magistrate judge's disposition to which proper, specific objections are made; arguments directed to findings for which no objection is made are waived.
2. Plaintiff's objections did not establish reversible error in the Commissioner's decision; the Commissioner's decision was affirmed, remand was denied, and the action was dismissed with prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." (at 2)

"The statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income under Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act. An administrative law judge denied the application, and Plaintiff challenged the decision in federal district court, arguing that the ALJ's determination was not supported by substantial evidence and that an alleged error was not harmless. The district court accepted the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions rejecting those arguments.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an action on July 1, 2024, seeking review of the denial of Social Security disability benefits. The parties submitted briefing, and the magistrate judge issued a June 23, 2025 report and recommendation

recommending that the Commissioner's decision be affirmed and the action dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiff objected on July 3, 2025, asserting that the administrative law judge's error was not harmless and requesting remand. The district court rejected the objections after de novo review and adopted the report and recommendation.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand. The court denied Plaintiff's request for remand, affirmed the Commissioner's decision, dismissed the action with prejudice, and directed entry of judgment.

CASES CITED

- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Chith v. Haynes, 2021 WL 4744596, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 12, 2021)