

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

YVONNE SCHOCKLEY,)	
)	CASE NO. 1:17CV2621
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
)	
NANCY A. BERRYHILL,)	
ACTING COMMISSIONER OF)	
SOCIAL SECURITY,)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>
Defendant.)	<u>AND ORDER</u>

An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) denied Plaintiff Yvonne Schockley’s applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income, after a hearing on March 3, 2015. The Appeals Council remanded Schockley’s case for the ALJ to consider newly submitted evidence. The ALJ held a second hearing on August 2, 2016, and again denied Plaintiff’s applications. The Appeals Council denied Plaintiff’s request to review the ALJ’s decision, thereby rendering the ALJ’s decision the final decision of the Commissioner.

On December 18, 2017, Plaintiff filed a Complaint ([ECF No. 1](#)), seeking judicial review of the Commissioner’s decision. The Court referred the case to Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Parker for preparation of a report and recommendation pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636](#) and [Local Rule 72.2\(b\)\(1\)](#). On December 3, 2018, the magistrate judge submitted a Report & Recommendation ([ECF No. 16](#)) recommending that the Court affirm the Commissioner’s decision as supported by substantial evidence and made pursuant to proper legal standards.

(1:17CV2621)

Specifically, the magistrate judge found that the ALJ applied proper legal procedures in weighing personal, educational, and vocational evidence, relevant medical evidence (of Plaintiff's physical and mental health), relevant opinion evidence, a relevant third-party statement, and relevant testimonial evidence. [ECF No. 16 at PageID#: 1804-22](#). The magistrate judge also found that the ALJ reached a decision supported by substantial evidence in evaluating Plaintiff's subjective symptom complaints. [Id. at PageID#: 1826-31](#).

[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 were, therefore, due on December 17, 2018. 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 & Recommendation of the magistrate judge ([ECF No. 16](#)) 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.

December 19, 2018
Date

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