UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

DORIS CRUMBLEY,

Case No. 1:17-cv-2096

Plaintiff,

VS.

OPINION & ORDER [Resolving Doc. 1]

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On August 16, 2013, Plaintiff Doris Crumbley filed an application for disability insurance benefits with the Social Security Administration (the "SSA"). And, on September 27, 2013, she filed an application for supplemental security income with the SSA.² In both applications, Plaintiff alleged that she became disabled on January 19, 2013.3

On September 30, 2013, the SSA denied both applications.⁴ The SSA then denied Plaintiff's request for reconsideration on January 9, 2014.⁵ Plaintiff Crumbley then requested an ALJ hearing, ⁶ which occurred on June 22, 2015. Shortly thereafter, the ALJ issued a partially favorable decision, concluding that Plaintiff was disabled, but that her disability began on September 4, 2014, rather than January 13, 2013, as Plaintiff had claimed.⁸ Plaintiff Crumbley sought review of that decision by the Social Security Appeals Council. The Appeals Council denied her request.⁹

Plaintiff then brought this suit, requesting review of the ALI's decision. Decision. Plaintiff claims that: (i) the ALJ failed to consider her back pain and mental problems as "severe impairments"

¹ Doc. 13 at 220-26.

² *Id.* at 227-32.

³ *Id.* at 220, 227.

⁴ *Id.* at 88-113.

ld. at 116-43.

⁶ *Id.* at 171-72.

Id. at 43-83.

⁸ Id. at 14-42.

⁹ *Id.* at 1-13.

¹⁰ Doc. 1.

Case No. 1:17-cv-2096

Gwin, J.

and (ii) the ALJ incorrectly concluded that Plaintiff was capable of performing work that existed in

significant numbers in the national economy in the time before September 4, 2014.¹¹ Magistrate

Judge Greenberg has considered Plaintiff's case and recommends that the Court affirm the ALJ's

decision.¹² Neither Plaintiff nor Defendant have objected to that recommendation.

If a party had objected to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation, the Court would consider

the objected-to portions of the recommendation *de novo*. ¹³ Because neither party has objected, the

Court may adopt the Report and Recommendation without review.¹⁴

Moreover, the Court has conducted its own review of the briefing and record and agrees with

the conclusions in the Report and Recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and

AFFIRMS the ALJ's decision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 13, 2018

James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Doc. 21.

¹³ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

¹⁴ Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).