

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

**DACIO PEREZ,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**CAROLYN COLVIN, Acting  
Commissioner of Social Security,**

**Defendant.**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**CIVIL ACTION NO.:**

**12-CV-5570-CDJ**

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 21<sup>st</sup> day of April, 2014, it is hereby **ORDERED**:

- 1.) the Report and Recommendation of the Honorable Elizabeth T. Hey, United States Magistrate Judge, (Doc. No. 16), is **ADOPTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**;<sup>1</sup>
- 2.) The Commissioner’s decision denying Plaintiff’s application for DIB and SSI is **AFFIRMED**;
- 3.) The clerk of court is directed to **CLOSE THE CASE** for statistical purposes.

**BY THE COURT:**

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

---

<sup>1</sup>When 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, 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). Plaintiff did not file timely objections, so the court has reviewed the report and recommendation for clear error.