

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Mary Woods,

Case No. 3:18-cv-1070

Plaintiff

v.

MEMORANDUM OPINION
AND ORDER

Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant

Before me is the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Parker. (Doc. No. 17). Judge Parker recommends I affirm the final decision of Defendant Commissioner of Social Security denying Plaintiff Mary Woods’s applications for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income. (*Id.*). Woods timely filed objections to the R & R, (Doc. No. 18), and the Commissioner filed a response, (Doc. No. 19).

A district court must conduct a *de novo* review of “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.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

A general objection that does not “address specific concerns with the magistrate’s report” will not suffice. *Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2) (“[A] party may serve and file *specific* written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis added).

In this case, Woods raises one objection not to Judge Parker’s R & R, but the ALJ’s decision alone. (Doc. No. 18). Because Woods “simply objected to the report and recommendation and referred to [one] issue[] in the case” rather than “specifically [] address the findings of the magistrate,” her general objection does not amount to a legitimate appeal of the R & R. *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995); *see also, e.g., Andres v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 733 F. App’x 241, 244 (6th Cir. 2018) (“Because Andres failed to pinpoint the magistrate judge’s alleged errors, he has forfeited his arguments on appeal.”); *King v. Caruso*, 542 F. Supp. 2d 703, 706 (E.D. Mich. 2008) (“[I]f the ‘objection’ merely states a disagreement with the magistrate’s suggested resolution or summarizes what was brought before the magistrate, it is not an objection for the purposes of this review.”).

On independent review of the R & R, I conclude Judge Parker’s recommendation and findings are supported by the relevant facts and applicable law. Therefore, Woods’s objection is overruled, and Judge Parker’s R & R is adopted, in full.

So Ordered.

s/ Jeffrey J. Helmick
United States District Judge