

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

|                                      |   |                          |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| <b>JULIANNE P.,</b>                  | ) |                          |
|                                      | ) |                          |
| <b>Plaintiff,</b>                    | ) |                          |
|                                      | ) |                          |
| <b>v.</b>                            | ) | <b>2:22-cv-00064-JDL</b> |
|                                      | ) |                          |
| <b>KILOLO KIJAKAZI,</b>              | ) |                          |
| <b>Acting Commissioner of Social</b> | ) |                          |
| <b>Security,</b>                     | ) |                          |
|                                      | ) |                          |
| <b>Defendant.</b>                    | ) |                          |

**ORDER ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION  
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Julianne P. seeks judicial review of the Acting Social Security Administration Commissioner’s final decision determining that she is not disabled and denying her applications for a Period of Disability, Disability Insurance Benefits, and Supplemental Security Income Benefits (ECF Nos. 1, 13). Plaintiff primarily contends that (1) the Administrative Law Judge failed to adequately develop the record because he did not include limitations to Plaintiff’s ability to interact with the general public in his hypothetical questions to the vocational expert, even though one of the limitations to Plaintiff’s residual functional capacity (“RFC”) was that she not interact with the general public; and (2) the Administrative Law Judge did not ask Plaintiff whether her past relevant work required her to interact with the general public.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(3) (West 2022) and D. Me. Local R. 16.3(a)(2), United States Magistrate Judge Karen Frink Wolf held a hearing on Plaintiff’s

Statement of Errors (ECF No. 13) on September 16, 2022. The Magistrate Judge filed her Recommended Decision with the Court on December 8, 2022 (ECF No. 18), recommending that the Court affirm the Acting Commissioner's decision. Plaintiff objected to the Recommended Decision on December 22, 2022 (ECF No. 19). The Acting Commissioner filed a Response to the Plaintiff's Objection (ECF No. 20) on January 3, 2023.

After reviewing and considering the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision, together with the entire record, I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision. I concur with the Magistrate Judge's conclusions as set forth in her Recommended Decision and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 18) of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **ACCEPTED**, and the Acting Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

**Dated this 6th day of February, 2023.**

/s/ Jon D. Levy  
**CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE**