

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

**PATRICIA A. TAYLOR,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Case No.: 2:16-cv-1118  
JUDGE GEORGE C. SMITH  
Magistrate Judge Deavers**

**COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,**

**Defendant.**

**ORDER**

This case is before the Court to consider the *Report and Recommendation* issued by the Magistrate Judge on February 20, 2018. The Magistrate Judge recommended that Plaintiff's State of Errors be overruled and the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security be affirmed. (*See Report and Recommendation*, Doc. 16). This matter is now before the Court on Plaintiff's Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Report and Recommendation*. (Doc. 17). The Court will consider the matter *de novo*. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

Plaintiff raises two objections to the *Report and Recommendation*, the same two arguments raised in her Statement of Errors and considered by the Magistrate Judge in her *Report and Recommendation*. First, Plaintiff asserts that the "Magistrate Judge erred in recommended that the Court overrule Plaintiff's first contention of error (regarding the ALJ's failure to find Plaintiff's headaches to be a 'severe impairment')." (Doc. 17, Pl.'s Objs. at 3). Plaintiff references several pages of the record in support of her contention that her headaches

should be a sign of severe impairment. Plaintiff further directs this Court to *Blevins -Bryant v. Colvin*, 2015 WL 4498573, \*\*4–5 (S.D. Ohio 2015) (Ovington, M.J.), which found that the ALJ “erred by relying on the objective evidence of Plaintiff’s migraines to assess the severity and frequency of headaches.”

The Court has carefully considered Plaintiff’s objection, but finds that the decision of the ALJ was supported by substantial evidence and set forth in detail in the Magistrate Judge’s *Report and Recommendation*. Plaintiff’s headaches were no so severe to require anything more than conservative treatment, and were not found to be a severe impairment.

Second, Plaintiff argues that the “Magistrate Judge erred in recommending that the Court overrule Plaintiff’s second contention of error (regarding the ALJ’s failure to address all medical opinions of record).” (Doc. 17, Pl.’s Objs. at 7). As discussed in detail in the *Report and Recommendation*, the ALJ considered all of the medical evidence, but is not required to discuss every piece of evidence. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis that the ALJ’s failure to discuss Dr. Manges’ opinion does not warrant remand for the reasons set forth in detail in the *Report and Recommendation*. Therefore, for the reasons stated in the well-reasoned *Report and Recommendation*, this Court finds that Plaintiff’s objections are without merit.

Based on the aforementioned and the detailed *Report and Recommendation*, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s objections have been thoroughly considered and are hereby **OVERRULED**. Accordingly, the *Report and Recommendation*, Document 16, is **ADOPTED** and **AFFIRMED**. Plaintiff’s Statement of Errors is hereby **OVERRULED**, and the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is **AFFIRMED**.

The Clerk shall remove Documents 16 and 17 from the Court's pending motions list, and enter final judgment in favor of Defendant, the Commissioner of Social Security.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

*/s/ George C. Smith*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**GEORGE C. SMITH, JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**