

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>DOUGLAS BAKER,</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 5:13 CV 2076</b>
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	<b>JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT</b>
<b>CAROLYN W. COLVIN,</b>	)	
<b>ACTING COMMISSIONER</b>	)	
<b>OF SOCIAL SECURITY,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	<b><u>MEMORANDUM OPINION</u></b>

This matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge George J. Limbert. (Docket #17). On September 18, 2013, Plaintiff, Douglas Baker, filed his Complaint (Docket #1) challenging the final decision of the Acting Commissioner of Social Security denying his claim for Supplemental Security Income. Pursuant to Local Rule 72.2(b), the case was referred to Magistrate Judge Limbert.

On January 26, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued his Report and Recommendation. The Magistrate Judge found the Commissioner’s decision denying Supplemental Security Income to be supported by substantial evidence and recommends that the Commissioner’s decision be affirmed. Objections to the Report and Recommendation were to be filed within 14 days of service. No objections were filed.

### **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)(3) 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) addresses only the review of reports to which objections have been made; it does not indicate the appropriate standard of review for those reports to which no objections have been properly made. The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules commented on a district court's review of *unopposed* reports by magistrate judges. In regard to subsection (b) of Rule 72, the advisory committee stated: "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 (citation omitted).


The U.S. Supreme Court stated in *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985): "It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."

### **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

Limbert (Docket #17) is ADOPTED. The decision of the Commissioner denying Plaintiff's request for Social Security Income is AFFIRMED. Plaintiff's request that the case be reversed and remanded (Docket #1) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
DONALD C. NUGENT  
United States District Judge

DATED: March 24, 2015