

**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

OPINION

(SS) Rinzel v. Commissioner of Social Security

PER CURIAM.

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
12 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