

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.

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