

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Jacqueline C., on behalf of JL v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of
Social Security**

Jacqueline C. · No. 3:24-cv-1032-RBM-KSC · Decided July 14, 2025

OPINION

Cervantes v. O'Malley

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 JACQUELINE C., on behalf of JL, a Case No.: 3:24-cv-1032-RBM-KSC minor 12
ORDER: Plaintiff,

13 (1) ADOPTING REPORT AND

v. RECOMMENDATION

14

(2) VACATING

FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner of

15 COMMISSIONER'S

Social Security1 DECISION; and 16 Defendant. (3) REMANDING FOR FURTHER

17 ADMINISTRATIVE

PROCEEDINGS

18 19 [Docs. 12–13] 20 21 Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of
Magistrate Judge 22 Karen S. Crawford, filed on June 10, 2025 (Doc. 27), on the parties’ briefing
(Docs. 21, 23 25–26). The R&R recommends the Court vacate the final decision of the
Commissioner 24 and remand for further proceedings. (Doc. 27.) The deadline for filing
objections to the 25 26 27 1 Frank Bisignano is now the Commissioner of the Social Security
Administration and is 28 1 ||R&R was no later than June 24, 2025. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (objections
due 14 days after 2 ||recommendation issued); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) (objections to findings and 3
||recommendations on dispositive motions due within 10 days). No objections have been 4 || filed.
5 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) set forth a district 6 ||court’s
duties in connection with a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation. The 7 || district court
“must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that 8 been properly
objected to” and “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the 9 || findings or
recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 10 || U.S.C. § 636(b)

(1); see also *United States v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 673-76 (1980); *United States v. Remsing*, 874 F.2d 614, 617 (9th Cir. 1989). However, in the absence of timely objection, the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (citing *Campbell v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); see also *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[T]he district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise.”) (emphasis in original). Here, neither party has filed objections to Magistrate Judge Crawford’s R&R. Having reviewed the R&R, the Court finds that it is thorough, well-reasoned, and contains no clear error. Accordingly, the Court hereby: (1) ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Crawford’s R&R (Doc. 27); (2) VACATES the Commissioner’s decision; and (3) REMANDS this matter with instructions to reevaluate the evidence of record. The Clerk shall enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: July 14, 2025 Fe Le ; ? L é >
HON. RUTH BERMUDEZ MONTENEGRO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28