UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO		
CATHERINE MCCALPINE, Plaintiff,	: : :	CASE NO. 1:13-CV-00599
v. COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	OPINION & ORDER [Resolving Docs. <u>1</u> and <u>15</u> ]
Defendant.	:	

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On April 16, 2014, Magistrate Judge James R. Knepp II recommended that the Court affirm the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of supplemental security income to Plaintiff Catherine McCalpine.<sup>1/</sup> Plaintiff McCalpine has not filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation. The Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's decision.

The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to conduct a *de novo* review only of those portions of a Report and Recommendation to which the parties have made an objection.<sup>2/</sup> Parties must file any objections to a Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of service.<sup>3/</sup> Failure to object within that time waives a party's right to appeal the Magistrate Judge's

 $\frac{1}{Doc. 15}$ .  $\frac{2}{28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)}$ .  $\frac{3}{Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a)}$ . Case No. 1:13-CV-00599 Gwin, J.

recommendation.<sup>4/</sup> Absent objection, a district court may adopt the Magistrate Judge's report without review.<sup>5/</sup> Moreover, having conducted its own review of the complaint<sup>6/</sup> and briefing,<sup>7/</sup> this Court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** in whole Magistrate Judge Knepp's findings of fact and conclusions of law and incorporates them fully herein by reference. The Court **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 14, 2014

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

 $\frac{6}{Doc. 1}$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4/</sup>*Id.*; see <u>Thomas v. Arn</u>, 474 U.S. 140, 145 (1985); <u>United States v. Walters</u>, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5/</sup>*Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 149.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup> $\frac{7}{2}$ </sup>Doc. <u>13</u> (Plaintiff's brief); Doc. <u>14</u> (Commissioner's brief).