

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) denied Plaintiff Paula Mary Bokisa’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 the Court referred the case to Magistrate Judge James R. Knepp, II 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 ([ECF No. 14](#)) recommending that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed as supported by substantial evidence. Specifically, the magistrate judge recommends that the Court find: (1) the ALJ did not err in finding Plaintiff's gastrointestinal problems were not severe; (2) the gastrointestinal problems were considered in the ALJ's RFC determination; and (3) the ALJ's RFC determination is supported by substantial evidence. [ECF No. 14 at PageID #: 894](#). In addition, the magistrate judge recommends that the Court find the ALJ's explanations for partially discrediting Plaintiff's testimony are reasonable

(1:16CV00083)

and supported by substantial evidence in the record. *Id. at PageID #: 898.* Finally, the magistrate judge recommends that the Court find the ALJ did not err in finding Plaintiff capable of performing her past work of accounting clerk, customer service clerk, and floral designer because substantial evidence supports the hypothetical questions the ALJ posed to the Vocational Expert. *Id. at PageID #: 899.*

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 and Recommendation were, therefore, due on February 1, 2017. 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.

February 6, 2017  
Date

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