

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

ALEX MUBARAC,)	CASE NO. 1:17 CV 2557
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
v.)	
)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OPINION</u>
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL)	
SECURITY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

This matter comes before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Parker. (ECF #19). On December 8, 2017, Plaintiff Alex Mubarak filed his Complaint (ECF #1) challenging the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying his application for disability insurance benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act. In his Report and Recommendation Magistrate Judge Parker found that the administrative law judge applied the proper legal standards and reached a decision supported by substantial evidence. As such, Magistrate Judge Parker recommends that the Commissioner’s final decision be affirmed.

Standard of Review for a Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation

The applicable standard of review of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation depends upon whether objections were made to that report. When objections are made to a report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court reviews the case *de novo*. FED R. Civ. P. 72(b) states:

The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition;

receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

The text of Rule 72(b)(3) addresses only the review of portions of reports to which timely objections have been made; it does not indicate the appropriate standard of review for portions of the report to which no objections have properly been made. The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules commented on the standard of review stating, “when no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s notes (citations omitted).

The U.S. Supreme Court stated: “It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to these findings.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Here, no objection was filed by either party. Accordingly, this Court reviews the Report and Recommendation for a finding of clear error on the face of the record.

Conclusion

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report and Recommendation and agrees with the findings set forth therein. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Thomas (ECF #19) is ADOPTED. The decision of the Commissioner denying Plaintiff’s request for Disability Insurance Benefits is AFFIRMED.

IT IS SO ORDERED



DONALD C. NUGENT
United States District Court

DATED: December 27, 2018