Taylor v. Colvin Doc. 21

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

EDWARD A. TAYLOR,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

No. 1:15-CV-00403 (MAT) DECISION AND ORDER

NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

Represented by counsel, Edward A. Taylor ("plaintiff") brings this action pursuant to Title II of the Social Security Act ("the Act"), seeking review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security ("the Commissioner") denying his application for disability insurance benefits. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The matter is before the Court on the parties' cross motions for judgment on the pleadings. The parties' motions were referred to Magistrate Judge Jeremiah J. McCarthy for consideration of the factual and legal issues presented, and to prepare and file a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") containing a recommended disposition of the issues raised.

By R&R dated May 17, 2017, Judge McCarthy recommended that the case be remanded for further administrative proceedings, for the reasons described therein. Docket No. 19. Both parties were notified that they were given 14 days within which to file objections; however, neither party has filed an objection.

Within fourteen days after a party has been served with a copy

of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the party "may

serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed

findings and recommendations." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). "Where no

objection is made to a report and recommendation, or the parties

make frivolous, conclusive, or general objections, only 'clear

error' review is required by the district court." Teixeria v. St.

Jude Med. S.C., Inc., 193 F. Supp. 3d 218, 222 (W.D.N.Y. 2016).

"After conducting the appropriate review, the district judge may

'accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or

recommendations made by the magistrate judge.'" Id. (quoting 28

U.S.C. § 636(b)). No objections having been filed, the Court has

reviewed the R&R for clear error and finds none.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the R&R (Docket No. 19) is approved and adopted

in its entirety. The Commissioner's motion for judgment on the

pleadings (Docket No. 17) is denied, and plaintiff's motion for

judgment on the pleadings (Docket No. 10) is granted to the extent

that the case is remanded for further administrative proceedings.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

ALL OF THE ABOVE IS SO ORDERED.

S/Michael A. Telesca

HON. MICHAEL A. TELESCA United States District Judge

Dated: October 11, 2017

Rochester, New York.