

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MICHELLE WILKERSON,

Petitioner,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,

Respondent.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION NO.:

2:13-CV-199

ORDER

AND NOW, this 16th day of October 2013, upon finding that neither party has objected to the report and recommendation of Magistrate Judge Jacob P. Hart, and after a review of the report and recommendation for clear error,¹ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- 1.) The report and recommendation of Judge Hart, (Doc. No. 12), is **ADOPTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**.
- 2.) Claimant's request for review is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**.
- 3.) The matter shall be **REMANDED** for reconsideration of Claimant's carpal tunnel syndrome, ulcerative colitis, limitation in concentration, persistence and pace, and GAF scores.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ C. Darnell Jones II, J.
C. DARNELL JONES II, J.

¹When timely objections are filed to the report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court must review de novo those portions of the report and recommendation to which objection is made. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1). If there are no objections to the report and recommendation or when reviewing those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are directed if there are objections, the court should, as a matter of good practice, "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(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987).