

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
ROCK ISLAND DIVISION

DEAN W. WETZEL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 4:13-cv-04070-SLD-JEH
)	
CAROLYN W. COLVIN,)	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL)	
SECURITY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Jonathan Hawley, ECF No. 20, that was filed with the Court on February 3, 2015. The Government filed its Objection to the Recommended Decision, ECF No. 23, on March 10, 2015. Plaintiff Dean W. Wetzel filed his Response to Defendant’s Objection to the Recommended Decision, ECF No. 24, on March 18, 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 and recommendation 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 Recommended Decision, together with the entire record, the Court concurs with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision.

1. It is therefore ORDERED that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge, ECF No. 20, is hereby ADOPTED.
2. It is ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 11, is GRANTED to the extent detailed in numbered paragraph three of this Order and Defendant's Motion for Summary Affirmance, ECF No. 16 is DENIED.
3. It is ORDERED that this case shall be REMANDED to the Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to the fourth sentence of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings consistent with the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge.
4. The Clerk is hereby DIRECTED to enter Judgment in favor of the Plaintiff and against the Defendant pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58. This matter is now TERMINATED.

Entered this 30th day of March, 2015.

s/ Sara Darrow

SARA DARROW
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE