

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

---

DAVID HUNT,	:	
	:	
	:	Case No. 5:17-cv-2089
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
vs.	:	OPINION & ORDER
	:	[Resolving Doc. 15]
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	:	
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	

---

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

In this case, Plaintiff David Hunt challenges the Social Security Administration’s (“SSA”) denial of his application for disability benefits.<sup>1</sup>

Hunt alleges that, since at least February 2013, he has suffered from a variety of psychological ailments, including bipolar disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, and major depressive disorder.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, in September 2014, Plaintiff Hunt applied for social security disability benefits.<sup>3</sup> However, SSA denied Plaintiff’s application and his subsequent request for reconsideration.<sup>4</sup> After an October 2016 hearing, an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) also concluded that Plaintiff was not disabled.<sup>5</sup> The SSA Appeals Council declined to review the ALJ’s decision.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. 1.  
<sup>2</sup> Doc. 13 at 3–8.  
<sup>3</sup> Doc. 10 at 166–67.  
<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 90–106.  
<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 11–26.  
<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 5–10.

Plaintiff now asks the Court to reverse the ALJ's denial of benefits.<sup>7</sup> Magistrate Judge Burke issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Court affirm the ALJ's decision.<sup>8</sup> Neither party objected to that recommendation.

If a party had objected to the Report and Recommendation, the Court would consider the objected-to findings and conclusions *de novo*.<sup>9</sup> However, because neither party has objected, they have waived the Court's review.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's conclusions.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and **AFFIRMS** the ALJ's decision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 22, 2019

*s/ James S. Gwin*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES S. GWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>7</sup> Doc. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Doc. 15.

<sup>9</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

<sup>10</sup> *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985) (holding that Congress did not intend to “require district court review of a magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions . . . when neither party objects to those findings.”).