

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JAMES HUCKLEBERRY,

Plaintiff,

Case No: 1:11-cv-283

v

HON. JANET T. NEFF

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

---

**OPINION AND ORDER**

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, seeks judicial review of a decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration.<sup>1</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report and Recommendation (R & R), recommending that this Court affirm the Commissioner's decision to deny Plaintiff's claim for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's purported objection to the Report and Recommendation.

When objections are received to a magistrate judge's report on a dispositive matter, the district judge "must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Here, Plaintiff submitted a document stating merely that he "disagree [sic] to all underlined writing [sic] in this Report," attaching an underlined copy of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation in this case (Dkt 22).

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court notes that Plaintiff was represented by counsel in the administrative proceedings.

While a pro se litigant's objection should be liberally construed by the Court, *see Boswell v. Mayer*, 169 F.3d 384, 387 (6th Cir. 1999), Plaintiff's objection wholly fails to supply the basis for his objection. The local rules of this Court require that the objecting party "specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objections are made *and* the basis for such objections." W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b) (emphasis added). Plaintiff's mere dissatisfaction with the result in his case, without any explanation as to how the Magistrate Judge might have erred in evaluating the Commissioner's decision or applying the pertinent legal standards, cannot serve as a basis for rejecting the Report and Recommendation. Therefore,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Objection (Dkt 22) is DENIED, the Report and Recommendation (Dkt 21) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court, and the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is AFFIRMED.

A Judgment will be entered consistent with this Opinion and Order.

Dated: September 6, 2012

/s/ Janet T. Neff  
JANET T. NEFF  
United States District Judge