

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

|                         |   |                                     |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| DELORES BECK-PATTERSON, | ) |                                     |
|                         | ) | CASE NO. 1:14CV0864                 |
| Plaintiff,              | ) |                                     |
|                         | ) |                                     |
| v.                      | ) | JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON             |
|                         | ) |                                     |
| CAROLYN W. COLVIN,      | ) |                                     |
| ACTING COMMISSIONER OF  | ) |                                     |
| SOCIAL SECURITY,        | ) |                                     |
|                         | ) | <b><u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u></b> |
| Defendant.              | ) | <b><u>AND ORDER</u></b>             |

An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) denied Plaintiff Delores Beck-Patterson’s application for Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”) after a hearing in the above-captioned case. That decision became the final determination of the Commissioner of Social Security when the Appeals Council denied the request to review the ALJ’s decision. The claimant sought judicial review of the Commissioner’s decision, and this Court referred the case to Magistrate Judge George J. Limbert for preparation of a report and recommendation pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636](#) and [Local Rule 72.2\(b\)\(1\)](#). The Magistrate Judge submitted a Report and Recommendation ([ECF No. 15](#)) recommending that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed as supported by substantial evidence. Specifically, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court find no violation of the treating physician rule. [ECF No. 15 at PageID #: 926](#). In addition, he recommends that the Court find that the ALJ did not err in assigning great weight to the opinion of Herschel Goren, M.D., a medical expert (“M.E.”). [ECF No. 15 at PageID #: 927](#).

(1:14CV0864)

[Fed. R. Civ. P. 72\(b\)\(2\)](#) provides that objections to a report and recommendation must be filed within 14 days after service. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report were, therefore, due on April 23, 2015.<sup>1</sup> Neither party has filed objections, evidencing satisfaction with the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. Any further review by this Court would be a duplicative and inefficient use of the Court's limited resources. [Thomas v. Arn, 728 F.2d 813 \(6th Cir. 1984\)](#), [aff'd, 474 U.S. 140 \(1985\)](#); [Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 932 F.2d 505 \(6th Cir. 1991\)](#); [United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 \(6th Cir. 1981\)](#).

Accordingly, the report and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is hereby adopted. The decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is affirmed. Judgment will be entered in favor of Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

May 11, 2015  
Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson  
Benita Y. Pearson  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Under [Fed. R. Civ. P. 6\(d\)](#), three days must be added to the fourteen-day time period because Petitioner was served the Magistrate Judge's Report by electronic mail. See [Dunn v. Commissioner of Social Sec., No. 00-1050, 2000 WL 1679496, at \\*1 \(6th Cir. Nov. 3, 2000\)](#) (citing former Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(e)); [Electronic Filing Policies and Procedures Manual \(July 26, 2011\) at 6](#).