

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Wilmore L. Washington III v. Farmington Estates Owners Association; Northwest Community Management, LLC; Sara Berg; Michael Orrantia; Katie Patterson; Brian Hess; Jennifer Layton, The Management Trust; Natalie Seibel

Washington v. Farmington Estates Owners Association · No. 3:21-cv-01032-YY · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations. The court denied Plaintiff’s motion for leave to amend, granted Defendants’ motions for summary judgment, and dismissed the case with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karin J. Immergut
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	3:21-cv-01032-YY
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after Plaintiff objected to portions of them. The court conducted de novo review of the objected-to portions, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, denied leave to amend, granted Defendants' motions for summary judgment, and dismissed the action with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations to which a party objects under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions need not be reviewed de novo or under any other standard.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Wilmore L. Washington III v. Farmington Estates Owners Association, Northwest Community Management, LLC, Sara Berg, Michael

TOPICS

summary judgment

motion to amend

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

real estate

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies to the portions of a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations to which a party objects?
2. Whether to adopt the magistrate judge's recommendations denying Plaintiff leave to amend and granting Defendants' motions for summary judgment.
3. Whether the action should be dismissed with prejudice.

HOLDINGS

1. When a party objects to portions of a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, the district court must make a de novo determination of those specified portions; unobjected-to portions need not be reviewed de novo or under any other standard.
2. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations in full, denied Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend, and granted Defendants' motions for summary judgment.
3. The action was dismissed with prejudice after the court denied leave to amend and granted Defendants' motions for summary judgment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s F&R, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.””

“This Court DENIES Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend, GRANTS Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment, and DISMISSES this case with prejudice.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains little substantive factual discussion because it concerns adoption of a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations. Plaintiff sought leave to amend, and Defendants moved for summary judgment. The district court resolved the objections and adopted the magistrate judge's recommendations without separately recounting the underlying merits facts.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 7, 2025, Magistrate Judge You recommended denying Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend and granting Defendants' motions for summary judgment. Plaintiff objected to portions of the findings and recommendations. District Judge Immergut reviewed the objected-to portions de novo, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, and dismissed the case with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985)
- United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 154 (1985)

OPINION

Wilmore L. Washington III v. Farmington Estates Owners Association; Northwest Community Management, LLC; Sara Berg; Michael Orrantia; Katie Patterson; Brian Hess; Jennifer Layton, The Management Trust; Natalie Seibel

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

WILMORE L WASHINGTON III, Case No. 3:21-cv-01032-YY Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING
FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

v.

FARMINGTON ESTATES OWNERS

ASSOCIATION; NORTHWEST

COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT, LLC; SARA BERG; MICHAEL ORRANTIA; KATIE
PATTERSON; BRIAN HESS;

JENNIFER LAYTON, THE

MANAGEMENT TRUST; NATALIE

SEIBEL,

Defendants. IMMERGUT, District Judge. On November 7, 2025, Magistrate Judge You issued her Findings and Recommendations (“F&Rs”), ECF 188, 190, recommending that this Court deny Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend and grant Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment. This Court has reviewed de novo the portion of the F&Rs to which Plaintiff objected. This Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge You’s F&Rs. Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), as amended, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s

F&R, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R that are not objected to. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, sua sponte” whether de novo or under another standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. This Court has reviewed de novo the portions of Judge You’s F&R to which Plaintiff objected. Judge You’s F&Rs, ECF 188, 190, are adopted in full. This Court DENIES Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend, GRANTS Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment, and DISMISSES this case with prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 19th day of February, 2026. /s/ Karin J. Immergut Karin J. Immergut United States District Judge