

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

KOUT KHOUNSAKNARATH,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	No. 2:16-cv-03541
	:	
CAROLYN W. COLVIN,	:	
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,	:	
Defendant.	:	

---

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 14<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2017, upon consideration<sup>1</sup> of Plaintiff’s Complaint, ECF No. 3, Defendant’s Answer, ECF No. 7, Plaintiff’s Brief and Statement of Issues in Support of Request for Review, ECF No. 10, Defendant’s Response to Request for Review, ECF No. 13, Plaintiff’s reply, ECF No. 14, and of the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of Carol Sandra Moore Wells, United States Magistrate Judge, ECF No. 16, **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

1. The Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 16, is **APPROVED and**

**ADOPTED.**

---

<sup>1</sup> When neither party objects to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court is not statutorily required to review the report, under de novo or any other standard. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985). Nevertheless, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has held that it is better practice to afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report. *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987), *writ denied* 484 U.S. 837 (1987). “When no objections are filed, the 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 Hill v. Barnacle*, No. 15-3815, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 12370, at \*16-17 (3d Cir. 2016) (holding that even when objections are filed, district courts “are not required to make any separate findings or conclusions when reviewing a Magistrate Judge’s recommendation de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)”); *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).

2. Plaintiff's Request for Review, ECF No. 10, is **GRANTED**, and the matter is **REMANDED** to the Commissioner of Social Security pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) so that the Administrative Law Judge can complete steps three through five of the sequential evaluation process.

3. This case is **CLOSED**.

BY THE COURT:

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