

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DOROTHY ANTOINETTE WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 13-cv-12617

v.

HONORABLE STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**  
(document no. 15), **DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION**  
**FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT** (document no. 14), **GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S**  
**MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT** (document no. 11), and **REMANDING CASE**

The Social Security Administration denied plaintiff and claimant Dorothy Antoinette Williams' application for a period of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. An Administrative Law Judge issued the original decision. See ALJ Decision, ECF No. 9-2, at 15. After the SSA Appeals Council declined to review the ruling, Williams appealed to this Court. The Court referred the matter to United States Magistrate Judge Steven Whalen, and the parties filed cross motions for summary judgment. On August 7, 2014, Magistrate Judge Whalen issued a Report and Recommendation suggesting the Court grant Williams' motion to the extent it argues for remand of the case to the administrative level, and deny the Commissioner of Social Security's motion. Report, ECF No. 15.

Under Civil Rule 72(b), each party had fourteen days from the date of service to file any written objections to the recommended disposition. The statutory window has expired and neither party has filed any objections. De novo review of the magistrate judge's findings is therefore not required. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2)–(3) (mandating de novo review only

if the parties “serve and file specific written objection to the proposed findings and recommendations”). The Court has reviewed the file and the Report, and finds the magistrate judge’s analysis is proper. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report’s findings and conclusions, and will enter an appropriate judgment.

**ORDER**

**WHEREFORE**, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation (document no. 15) is **ADOPTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment (document no. 14) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Williams’ motion for summary judgment (document no. 11) is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the case be **REMANDED** to the administrative level for further administrative proceedings.

**SO ORDERED.**

s/Stephen J. Murphy, III  
STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III  
United States District Judge

Dated: September 22, 2014

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on September 22, 2014, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Carol Cohron  
Case Manager