



recommendation, but they must be “specific[,] written,” and submitted within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), or within seventeen days if the parties are served by mail, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d).

Insofar as a report and recommendation addresses a dispositive motion, a district court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which timely objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district court may adopt those portions of a report and recommendation to which no timely objections have been made, provided no clear error is apparent from the face of the record. Lewis v. Zon, 573 F. Supp. 2d 804, 811 (S.D.N.Y. 2008); Nelson v. Smith, 618 F. Supp. 1186, 1189 (S.D.N.Y. 1985). The clearly erroneous standard also applies when a party makes only conclusory or general objections, or simply reiterates his original arguments. Ortiz v. Barkley, 558 F. Supp. 2d 444, 451 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).

Neither party objected to Judge Smith’s thorough and well-reasoned R&R.

The Court has reviewed the R&R and finds no error, clear or otherwise.

The Court notes that plaintiff’s application for attorney’s fees pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d), is premature. See 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(B) (“A party seeking an award of fees and other expenses shall, within thirty days of final judgment in the action, submit to the court an application for fees and other expenses.”). Moreover, plaintiff’s applications for attorney’s fees and for approval of the contingent fee arrangement between plaintiff and his counsel lack any supporting documentation.

Accordingly, if plaintiff wishes to apply for an award of fees and other expenses and for approval of his contingency fee arrangement, he must submit applications in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §2412(d)(1)(B) and 42 U.S.C. § 406(b).

**CONCLUSION**

The R&R is adopted as the opinion of the Court.

Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings is DENIED. (Doc. #14).

Plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART WITHOUT PREJUDICE. (Doc. #19).

The case is REMANDED to the Social Security Administration for further administrative proceedings consistent with the R&R, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), sentence four.

The Clerk is instructed to enter Judgment accordingly and close this case.

Dated: July 10, 2018  
White Plains, NY

SO ORDERED:



Vincent L. Briccetti  
United States District Judge