

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Keyonna J. B. v. Leland Dudek, Acting Commissioner of Social
Security

Bateman · No. 2:24-cv-02943-WDK-BFM · Decided August 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California accepted the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation after conducting de novo review of the plaintiff’s objections. The court affirmed the administrative law judge’s decision, dismissed the complaint with prejudice, and directed entry of judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William D. Keller
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	August 5, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-02943-WDK-BFM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation and Plaintiff's objections in an action seeking judicial review of an administrative law judge's Social Security decision.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court conducted de novo review of the portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which specific objections were made. It declined to consider arguments raised for the first time in the objections and objections that merely repeated arguments already addressed and rejected.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Keyonna J. B. v. Leland Dudek, Acting Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should accept the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after conducting de novo review of the portions to which Plaintiff objected.
2. Whether the ALJ's decision should be affirmed and Plaintiff's complaint dismissed with prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court accepted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation because Plaintiff's objections did not affect its material findings and conclusions.
2. The ALJ's decision was affirmed, and Plaintiff's complaint and the action were dismissed with prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Concluding that nothing in Plaintiff's objections affects the material findings and conclusions in the Report and Recommendation, the Court accepts the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge." (Order at 2)

"The decision of the ALJ is affirmed." (Order at 2)

"Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed and the action is dismissed with prejudice." (Order at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Keyonna J. B. brought an action seeking review of an unfavorable Social Security administrative law judge decision. The district court reviewed the administrative record, the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, and Plaintiff's objections, and concluded that the objections did not affect the material findings or conclusions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation concerning Plaintiff's challenge to the ALJ's decision. After conducting de novo review of the portions to which Plaintiff objected, the district court accepted the Report and Recommendation, affirmed the ALJ's decision, and dismissed the action with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)
- United States v. Howell, 231 F.3d 615, 621-23 (9th Cir. 2000)

- Trejo Perez v. Madden, 2020 WL 1154807, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2020)
- Hagberg v. Astrue, 2009 WL 3386595, at *1 (D. Mont. Oct. 14, 2009)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 WESTERN DIVISION 11 12 KEYONNA J. B., No. 2:24-cv-02943-WDK-
BFM 13 Plaintiff, ORDER ACCEPTING 14 v. MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND 15
LELAND DUDEK, Acting RECOMMENDATION Commissioner of Social Security, 16
Defendant. 17 18 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Complaint, all 19 the
records and files herein, the Magistrate Judge's Report and 20 Recommendation (Doc.

No. 21), and Plaintiff's Objections to the Report and 21 Recommendation (Doc. No. 23). The
Court has engaged in a de novo review of 22 those portions of the Report and Recommendation to
which objections have been 23 made. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); United
States v. Reyna- 24 Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). 25 In doing so, the Court
has declined to consider any arguments raised for 26 the first time only in the objections.

See United States v. Howell, 231 F.3d 615, 27 621-23 (9th Cir. 2000). It has also declined to
consider objections that simply 28 repeat arguments fully addressed but rejected in the Report and
1 || Recommendation. See Trejo Perez v. Madden, 2020 WL 1154807, at *1 (E.D. Cal. 2 || Mar. 10,
2020) (objections that "merely repeat[] the same arguments... 3 || considered and found to be
insufficient" require no review since they "do not 4 || meaningfully dispute the magistrate judge's
findings and recommendations'); 5 || Hagberg v. Astrue, 2009 WL 3386595, at *1 (D.

Mont. Oct. 14, 2009) ("Objections 6 || to a magistrate's Findings and Recommendations are not a
vehicle for the losing 7 || party to relitigate its case."). 8 Concluding that nothing in Plaintiff's
objections affects the material 9 || findings and conclusions in the Report and Recommendation,
the Court accepts 10 || the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge.

11 ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED: 12 1. The Report and Recommendation is accepted. 13 2.
The decision of the ALJ is affirmed. 14 3. Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed and the action is
dismissed with 15 || prejudice. 16 4. Judgment shall be entered consistent with this Order. 17 5.

The Court Clerk shall serve this Order and the Judgment on all 18 || counsel or parties of record.
19 IT IS SO ORDERED. 20 Tiftceran 2 fet 21 || DATED: August 5, 2025 99 HONORABLE
WILLIAM D. KELLER SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 23 24 25 26 27 28