

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

| | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| ROBERT WOODEN, |) | |
| |) | CASE NO. 1:16CV1494 |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON |
| |) | |
| COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL |) | |
| SECURITY, |) | |
| |) | <u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u> |
| Defendant. |) | <u>AND ORDER</u> |

An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) denied Plaintiff Robert Wooden’s applications for a Period of Disability (“POD”), Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”), and Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”) 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 David A. Ruiz 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. 18](#)) recommending that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. Specifically, the magistrate judge recommends that the Court find: (1) the ALJ sufficiently set forth good reasons for rejecting the opinion of Plaintiff’s treating physician, Dr. Harwell ([ECF No. 18 at PageID #: 651-56](#)); (2) the ALJ adequately

(1:16CV1494)

considered relevant factors and sufficiently explained the weight accorded to the opinion of Plaintiff's nurse, Ms. Obias ([ECF No. 18 at PageID #: 657-60](#)); and (3) the ALJ complied with the articulation requirement applicable to non-medical sources when the ALJ explained the weight ascribed to the opinion of Plaintiff's social worker, Mr. Wooderd ([ECF No. 18 at PageID #: 661-62](#)).

[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 June 15, 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.

June 19, 2017
Date

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