

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANASTASIA C. WLADYSIAK,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-12961

Honorable Laurie J. Michelson

Magistrate Judge David R. Grand

**ORDER REGARDING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [23],
GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [15],
AND DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [21]**

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge David R. Grand’s Report and Recommendation. (R. 23.) At the conclusion of his June 30, 2017 Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Grand notified the parties that they were required to file any objections within 14 days of service, as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2) and Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 72.1(d), and that “[f]ailure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of any further right of appeal.” (R. 23, PID 1631.) It is now July 17, 2017. As such, the time to file objections has expired. And no objections have been filed.

The Court finds that the parties’ failure to object is a procedural default, waiving review of the Magistrate Judge’s findings by this Court. In *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949–50 (6th Cir. 1981), the Sixth Circuit established a rule of procedural default, holding that “a party shall file objections with the district court or else waive right to appeal.” And in *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 144 (1985), the Supreme Court explained that the Sixth Circuit’s waiver-of-appellate-review rule rested on the assumption “that the failure to object may constitute a procedural default waiving review even at the district court level.” 474 U.S. at 149; *see also*

Garrison v. Equifax Info. Servs., LLC, No. 10-13990, 2012 WL 1278044, at *8 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 16, 2012) (“The Court is not obligated to review the portions of the report to which no objection was made.” (citing *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 149–52)). The Court further held that this rule violates neither the Federal Magistrates Act nor the Federal Constitution.

The Court therefore finds that the parties have waived further review of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and accepts his recommended disposition. It follows that this Court GRANTS IN PART Wladysiak’s motion for summary judgment (R. 15), DENIES the Commissioner’s (R. 21), and REMANDS this case for further consideration pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). As this order resolves this litigation, a separate judgment will issue.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 17, 2017

s/Laurie J. Michelson
LAURIE J. MICHELSON
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court’s ECF System to their respective email or First Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on July 17, 2017.

s/Keisha Jackson
Case Manager