

district court need only review the record for plain error or manifest injustice.” Harper v. Sullivan, No. 89-4272, 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2168, at *2 n.3 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 22, 1991); see also Oldrati v. Apfel, 33 F. Supp. 2d 397, 399 (E.D. Pa. 1998) (explaining that in the absence of a timely objection, the court should review the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation for clear error). The district court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

III. Discussion

In the absence of objections, this Court has reviewed the record for plain error and has found none.

The R&R first outlines the factual and procedural background of the case, then sets forth the applicable standard of review. R&R 1-3. Magistrate Judge Heffley reviews the decision of the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) and finds that the ALJ properly considered all the evidence and gave correct weight to the medical evidence. R&R 3-8. Magistrate Judge Heffley explains why the ALJ properly discredited Plaintiff’s testimony. R&R 8-11. The Magistrate Judge further concludes that the ALJ considered the testimony of a vocational expert regarding the number of jobs in the national economy that Plaintiff was capable of performing. R&R 11-12. Finally, Magistrate Judge Heffley finds that the ALJ’s decision is supported by substantial evidence and recommends that the request for review be denied. R&R 12.

After review and in the absence of objections, this Court will adopt the R&R.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.
JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR.
United States District Judge