

inconsistency of Dr. Reddy's opinion with other evidence in the record. Regarding the additional medical evidence, the Plaintiff states there is "apparent confusion" regarding what evidence the Plaintiff claims is new and material. (Doc. 11 at 4). Perhaps so. Citing to Doc. 4-8 at 68-84, the Plaintiff asserts that he timely and properly submitted additional evidence to the Appeals Council. However, this is not the evidence the Plaintiff argues is new and material. (See Docs. 6 at 9-11; 7 at 1-25). Further, if this evidence were timely submitted to the Appeals Council, as the Plaintiff claims, it would not be new evidence pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The Plaintiff does not argue any other basis to show good cause for his failure to submit the additional evidence at the administrative level.

The Court has thoroughly considered the Plaintiff's objection and has made a de novo determination of the portions of the Recommendation to which the Plaintiff objects. Accordingly, the Court accepts and adopts the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. The Recommendation is adopted and made the order of this Court. The decision of the Commissioner is **AFFIRMED**.

SO ORDERED, this 19th day of August, 2014.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT