

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.

OPINION

Keyonna Jacarie Bateman v. Commissioner of Social Security
PER CURIAM.

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 repeat arguments fully addressed but rejected in the Report and Recommendation. See *Trejo Perez v. Madden*, 2020 WL 1154807, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2020) (objections that “merely repeat[] the same arguments... considered and found to be insufficient” require no review since they “do not meaningfully dispute the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations”); *Hagberg v. Astrue*, 2009 WL 3386595, at *1 (D. Mont. Oct. 14, 2009) (“Objections to a magistrate’s Findings and Recommendations are not a vehicle for the losing party to relitigate its case.”). 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. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED: 1. The Report and Recommendation is accepted. 2. The decision of the ALJ is affirmed. 3. Plaintiff’s Complaint is dismissed and the action is dismissed with prejudice. 4, Judgment shall be entered consistent with this Order. 5. The Court Clerk shall serve this Order and the Judgment on all counsel or parties of record. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Tiftceran 2 fet

DATED: August 5, 2025

HONORABLE WILLIAM D. KELLER

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23 24 25 26 27 28