

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
AIKEN DIVISION

Jamieka Rene Holmes,	)	Civil Action No.: 1:13-3430-BHH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b><u>OPINION AND ORDER</u></b>
	)	
Carolyn W. Colvin,	)	
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rules 73.02(B)(2)(a) and 83.VII.02 for the District of South Carolina. The plaintiff Jamieka Renee Holmes (“Plaintiff”), brought this action seeking judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying the plaintiff’s claim for Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”).

On November 6, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which she recommended that the Commissioner’s decision be reversed and remanded for further administrative proceedings. (ECF No. 22.) On November 17, 2014, the Commissioner filed “Defendant’s Notice of Not Filing Objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge” (ECF No. 24), and on November 19, 2014, the Plaintiff filed “Plaintiff’s Notice of Not Filing Objections to Report & Recommendation.” (ECF No. 26.)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final

determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to him with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir.2005).

The Court has carefully reviewed the record and concurs in the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. The Court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. The decision of the Commissioner to deny benefits is **reversed** and the action is **remanded** for further administrative action consistent with this order and the Report and Recommendation.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

December 2, 2014  
Greenville, South Carolina