PEARSON, J.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

| CHRISTINE MANGHAM, on behalf of <i>R.M.</i> | )<br>) CASE NO. 1:17CV40                      |
|---|---|
| Plaintiff,                                  | )<br>)<br>) JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON           |
| V.  | )   |
| COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL<br>SECURITY,         | )   |
| Defendant.                                  | ) <u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND</u><br>) ORDER |

An Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") denied Plaintiff Christine Mangham's application for Supplemental Social Security Income on behalf of her minor child, R.M., 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 Thomas M. Parker for preparation of a report and recommendation pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C. § 636</u> and <u>Local Rule 72.2(b)(1)</u>.

Magistrate Judge Parker issued a Report and Recommendation (<u>ECF No. 15</u>), recommending that the Court affirm the decision of the Commission.

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 (1:17CV40)

Recommendation were, therefore, due on December 26, 2017.<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.

January 3, 2018 Date /s/ Benita Y. Pearson

Benita Y. Pearson United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Because the fourteen-day period to file objections would otherwise have ended on December 25, 2017, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a)(1)(C) moved the cut-off date to December 26, 2017.