

**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).

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 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 reviewed de novo. See *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983) After reviewing the file, including Defendant’s objections, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1.

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

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; and 5.

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