

1. This case is **REMOVED** from the Civil Suspense Docket and is **RETURNED** to the active docket;³

2. The Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 16, is **APPROVED and ADOPTED**;

2. Plaintiff's Request for Review, ECF No. 11, is **GRANTED** and the matter is **REMANDED** under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative proceedings; and

3. The Clerk of Court shall mark this case **CLOSED** for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:

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

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).

³ The Court transferred this case to the Civil Suspense Docket in February 2018. ECF No. 15.