

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Breanna Kalaisha B. v. Frank Bisignano

Breanna Kalaisha B. · No. 2:25-CV-86 JCM (NJK) · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada adopted Magistrate Judge Koppe’s report and recommendation in a Social Security disability benefits appeal. Because no objections were filed, the court affirmed the Commissioner’s decision, directed entry of judgment for the defendant, and ordered the case closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-CV-86 JCM (NJK)
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought review of the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of her application for Title XVI disability benefits. The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending affirmance; no objections were filed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objection is made to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court is not required to conduct de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Breanna Kalaisha B. v. Frank Bisignano

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- social security
- administrative law
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court was required to conduct de novo review of the magistrate judge's report and recommendation when no objections were filed.
2. Whether the Commissioner's decision denying Plaintiff's Title XVI disability-benefits application should be affirmed.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court was not obligated to conduct de novo review because no objections were filed to the report and recommendation.
2. The Commissioner's decision was affirmed, and the magistrate judge's report and recommendation was adopted in full.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff applied for disability benefits under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. The Commissioner of Social Security denied the application. Plaintiff sought judicial review of that denial, and the magistrate judge recommended affirmance.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff appealed the Commissioner's decision to deny disability benefits. Magistrate Judge Koppe issued a report and recommendation recommending that the decision be affirmed. Because no objections were filed, the district court adopted the report and recommendation in full, affirmed the Commissioner's decision, entered judgment for defendant, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 6 * * * 7 BREANNA
KALAISHA B., Case No.2:25-CV-86 JCM (NJK) 8 Plaintiff(s), ORDER 9 v. 10 FRANK
BISIGNANO, 11 Defendant(s). 12 13 Presently before the court is Magistrate Judge Koppe’s
report and recommendation 14 (“R&R”). (ECF No. 27). Plaintiff appealed the Commissioner of
Social Security’s decision to 15 deny her application for disability benefits pursuant to Title XVI
of the Social Security Act.

(ECF 16 No. 21). After considering the parties’ respective arguments set forth in their briefs, Judge Koppe 17 recommends that the court affirm the decision below. (ECF No. 27). 18 No objections were filed to the R&R.

Thus, the court is not obligated to conduct a de novo 19 review of the R&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring courts to “make a de novo determination of 20 those portions of the report or specified proposed findings to which objection is made”); United 21 States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“[T]he district judge must 22 review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not 23 otherwise.”) (emphasis in original).

24 Accordingly, 25 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that Judge Koppe’s R&R 26 (ECF No. 27) be, and the same hereby is, ADOPTED, in full. 27 IF IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Commissioner’s decision below be AFFIRMED. 28 (See ECF No. 21). 1 The clerk of the court is INSTRUCTED to enter judgment in favor of defendant and close 2 this case. 3 DATED December 10, 2025.

4 _____ 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 6 7
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28