

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

ALTON ELWOOD WEAVER,	:	1:18-cv-61
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Hon. John E. Jones III
	:	
NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting	:	Hon. Martin C. Carlson
Commissioner of Social Security,	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER

March 12, 2019

AND NOW, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson (Doc. 16), recommending that we affirm the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying the Plaintiff’s application for disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act, and noting that the Plaintiff filed objections (Doc. 17) to the report to which the Commissioner has responded (Doc. 18),¹ and the Court finding Judge Carlson’s analysis to be thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by the record, and the

¹ Where objections to a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. *Supinski v. United Parcel Serv.*, Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing *Sample v. Diecks*, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). “In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires ‘written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.’” *Id.* (citing *Shields v. Astrue*, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at *6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

Court further finding Plaintiffs' objections² to be without merit **IT IS HEREBY**

ORDERED THAT:

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Carlson (Doc.16) is **ADOPTED** in its entirety.
2. The final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying the Plaintiff's applications for disability insurance under the Social Security Act is **AFFIRMED**.
3. The Clerk is directed to enter **JUDGMENT** in favor of the Commissioner.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** the file on this case.

s/ John E. Jones III

John E. Jones III

United States District Judge

² Plaintiff's submission contains no arguments that cause us to depart from the Magistrate Judge's appropriate reasoning and correct conclusions. Here, the ALJ's decision to deny Plaintiff's application for benefits is supported by substantial evidence that the Plaintiff could perform a limited range of light work. The arguments raised in the Plaintiff's objections have been, as pointed out by the Commissioner, previously raised and were considered by the Magistrate Judge in his thorough report and recommendation.