

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Tiffani Rinzel v. Martin O'Malley, Commissioner of Social Security

Rinzel · No. 1:22-CV-00143-DJC-GSA · Decided February 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California reviewed objections to a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a Social Security disability case. The court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, granted Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment, denied Defendant’s cross-motion, and remanded the matter to the Commissioner for further proceedings under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daniel J. Calabretta
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	February 24, 2025
DOCKET	1:22-CV-00143-DJC-GSA
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying her application for Supplemental Security Income. After a Magistrate Judge recommended granting Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and remanding the matter, Defendant objected. The District Court reviewed the objections and adopted the findings and recommendations in full.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The District Court reviews de novo those portions of a Magistrate Judge's proposed findings of fact to which a party objects and reviews the Magistrate Judge's conclusions of law de novo. Portions to which no objection is made are accepted as correct subject to applicable law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court order; precedential status not stated
PARTIES	Tiffani Rinzel v. Martin O'Malley, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

summary judgment

remedies

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations should be adopted after de novo review of Defendant's objections.
2. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to summary judgment and remand of the Commissioner's decision under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

HOLDINGS

1. The District Court must review de novo the portions of the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law to which a party objects, while portions not challenged by objection may be accepted as correct subject to applicable law.
2. The Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations were adopted in full; Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment was granted, Defendant's cross-motion was denied, and the matter was remanded to the Commissioner for further proceedings under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The matter is remanded to the Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings consistent with this order and with the findings and recommendations;” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Tiffani Rinzel applied for Supplemental Security Income under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. The Commissioner issued a final decision denying the application. The District Court found the Magistrate Judge's recommendation to grant summary judgment for Plaintiff and remand the matter to the Commissioner supported by the record and proper analysis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Rinzel filed an action under the Social Security Act seeking review of the denial of her Title XVI Supplemental Security Income application. The matter was referred to a Magistrate Judge, who recommended granting Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, denying Defendant's cross-motion, and remanding under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). After Defendant objected, the District Court reviewed the challenged portions de novo, adopted the findings and recommendations in full, granted Plaintiff's motion, denied Defendant's cross-motion, remanded for further proceedings, and directed entry of judgment for Plaintiff.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter is remanded to the Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings consistent with the order and the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations.

CASES CITED

- McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981)
- Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School District, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 TIFFANI RINZEL, No. 1:22-CV-00143-DJC-GSA 12
Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 MARTIN O'MALLEY, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,1
15 Defendant. 16 (ECF Nos. 20, 21, 25) 17 18 Plaintiff Tiffani Rinzel initiated this action seeking
judicial review of a final 19 decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying her
application for 20 Supplemental Security Income (SSI) pursuant to Title XVI of the Social
Security Act.

21 (ECF No. 1). The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 22 28
U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 23 On September 12, 2024, the Magistrate Judge filed
findings and 24 recommendations recommending that Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment be
25 granted, that Defendant's cross-motion be denied, and that the matter be remanded 26 to the
Commissioner for further proceedings pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 27 1 The Court has
substituted Martin O'Malley, who has been appointed Commissioner of Social Security, 28 as the
defendant in this case.

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d) 1 405(g). (ECF No. 25). The findings and recommendations advised the
parties that 2 objections were due within fourteen days. On September 13, 2024, Defendant filed 3
objections to the findings and recommendations, which the Court has considered. 4 The Court
reviews de novo those portions of the proposed findings of fact to 5 which an objection has been
made.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp v. 6 Commodore Business Machines, 656 F.2d
1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981); see also 7 Dawson v. Marshall, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009). As
to any portion of the 8 proposed findings of fact to which no objection has been made, the court
assumes its 9 correctness and decides the matter on the applicable law. See Orand v. United States,
10 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir.

1979). The Magistrate Judge's conclusions of law are 11 reviewed de novo. See *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983) 13 After reviewing the file, including Defendant's objections, the Court finds the 14 findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. 15 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 16 1.

The findings and recommendations filed September 12, 2024 17 (ECF No. 25) are ADOPTED IN FULL; 18 2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 20) is 19 GRANTED; 20 3. Defendant's cross-motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 21) is 21 DENIED; 22 4.

The matter is remanded to the Commissioner of Social Security 23 pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further 24 proceedings consistent with this order and with the findings and 25 recommendations; and 26 /// 27 /// 28 /// 1 5.

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in favor of 2 Plaintiff and against Defendant Commissioner of Social Security. 3 A IT IS SO ORDERED. 5 | Dated: _February 21, 2025
"Daniel A CoD tto— Hon. Daniel alabretta 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 7 8 9 10 11
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28