

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Muhammad Ashraf v. Providence Newberg Medical Center

Ashraf · No. 3:24-cv-02166-JR · Decided December 22, 2025

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
MUHAMMAD ASHRAF, Case No. 3:24-cv-02166-JR Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING F&R v.
PROVIDENCE NEWBERG MEDICAL CENTER, Defendant. Muhammad Ashraf, South Jordan,
UT 84009. Pro se. Colleen O. Munoz and Lisa P. Shevlin, Littler Mendelson, P.C., 1300 SW Fifth
Avenue, Suite 2050, Portland, OR 97201. Attorneys for Defendant.

IMMERGUT, District Judge. Magistrate Judge Russo has issued a Findings & Recommendation (“F&R”), ECF 33, recommending that Plaintiff’s Revised Motion to Amend Complaint, ECF 29, be granted in part and denied in part. This Court has reviewed de novo the portions of the F&R to which Plaintiff objected, and this Court ADOPTS Magistrate Judge Russo’s F&R.

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 to which no objections are addressed.

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 Russo’s F&R to which Plaintiff objected.

Judge Russo’s F&R, ECF 33, is adopted in full. This Court GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART Plaintiff’s Revised Motion to Amend Complaint, ECF 29. This Court GRANTS Plaintiff leave to amend with respect to his gender discrimination and retaliation claims and DENIES Plaintiff leave to amend with respect to all other remaining claims. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 22nd day of December, 2025. /s/ Karin J. Immergut Karin J. Immergut United States District Judge