

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
PEORIA DIVISION

MARC JONATHON CRAIG,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 1:13-cv-01252-SLD-JEH
)	
CAROLYN W. COLVIN,)	
ACTING COMMISSIONER OF)	
SOCIAL SECURITY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Jonathan Hawley, ECF No. 23, that was filed with the Court on February 3, 2015. Plaintiff Marc Jonathan Craig filed his Objection to the Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 24, on February 17, 2015. The Government filed its Response to Plaintiff’s Objection to the Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 26, on March 11, 2015.

The Court may accept, reject, or modify (in whole or in part) the findings or recommendations of the magistrate judge in a report and recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The Court must review *de novo* the portions of the report to which objections are made. *Id.* In making this determination, the Court must look to all of the evidence contained in the record and “give fresh consideration to those issues to which specific objections have been made.” *Rajaratnam v. Moyer*, 47 F.3d 922, 924 n.8 (7th Cir. 1995) (internal quotation marks omitted). The Court has reviewed the other portions of the report for clear error. *See Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999).

As an initial matter, the Court notes that the Magistrate Judge's role was simply to determine whether the decision of the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") was supported by substantial evidence. "Substantial evidence" is defined as "such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." *Skinner v. Astrue*, 478 F.3d 836, 841 (7th Cir. 2007). "The ALJ is not required to address every piece of evidence or testimony presented, but must provide a 'logical bridge' between the evidence and the conclusions" *Jones v. Astrue*, 623 F.3d 1155, 1160 (7th Cir. 2010). This Court may not reweigh evidence, decide questions of credibility, or substitute its judgment for that of the ALJ. *See Young v. Barnhart*, 362 F.3d 995, 1001 (7th Cir.2004).

Having reviewed and considered the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, together with the entire record, the Court concurs with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Report and Recommendation. The Court also determines that no further proceeding is necessary.

1. It is therefore ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, ECF No. 23, is hereby ADOPTED.
2. It is ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 14, is DENIED and Defendant's Motion for Summary Affirmance, ECF No. 19 is GRANTED.

Entered this 24th day of March, 2015.

s/ Sara Darrow

SARA DARROW
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE