UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

HILDA ORTEGA,

CASE NO. 1:13-CV-02080

Plaintiff,

:

v. : OPINION & ORDER

[Resolving Docs. <u>1</u> & <u>17</u>]

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

:

Defendant.

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On June 11, 2014, Magistrate Judge Vernelis K. Armstrong recommended that the Court affirm the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of supplemental security income^{1/2} to Plaintiff Hilda Ortega.^{2/2} Plaintiff Ortega 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.^{3/}
Parties must file any objections to a Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of service.^{4/}
Failure to object within that time waives a party's right to appeal the Magistrate Judge's

 $[\]frac{1}{P}$ Plaintiff Ortega originally sought disability insurance benefits as well, but she withdrew that request before the administrative law judge. *See* Doc. 15 at 1-2.

 $[\]frac{2}{10}$ Doc. 17.

 $[\]frac{3}{28}$ U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

 $[\]frac{4}{1}$ N.D. Ohio L.R. 72.3(b).

Case No. 1:13-CV-02080

Gwin, J.

recommendation.⁵/ Absent objection, a district court may adopt the Magistrate Judge's report

without review. 61 Moreover, having conducted its own review of the complaint 71 and briefing, 82 this

Court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS in whole Magistrate Judge Armstrong'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: July 3, 2014 s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁵/*Id.*; see *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 145 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

^{6/}*Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 149.

 $[\]frac{7}{2}$ Doc. 1.

 $[\]frac{8}{2}$ Doc. $\underline{15}$ (Plaintiff's brief); Doc. $\underline{16}$ (Commissioner's brief).