

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

<b>STEVEN J. EVANITUS,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:16-CV-845</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	<b>(Chief Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting</b>	:	
<b>Commissioner of Social Security,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendant</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 23rd day of March, 2018, upon consideration of the report (Doc. 15) of Magistrate Judge Karoline Mehalchick, recommending that the court vacate the decision of the administrative law judge denying the application of plaintiff Steven J. Evanitus (“Evanitus”) for disability insurance benefits, and remand this matter for further proceedings and development of the record, wherein Judge Mehalchick opines that the administrative law judge’s decision is not “supported by substantial evidence,” 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and it appearing that neither Evanitus nor the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) object to the report, see FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2), and the court noting that failure to timely object to a magistrate judge’s conclusions “may result in forfeiture of *de novo* review at the district court level,” Nara v. Frank, 488 F.3d 187, 194 (3d Cir. 2007) (citing Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878-79 (3d Cir. 1987)), but that, as a matter of good practice, a district court should “afford some level of review to dispositive legal issues raised by the report,” Henderson, 812 F.2d at 878; see also Taylor v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec., 83 F. Supp. 3d 625, 626 (M.D.

Pa. 2015) (citing Univac Dental Co. v. Dentsply Int'l, Inc., 702 F. Supp. 2d 465, 469 (M.D. Pa. 2010)), in order to “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record,” FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes, and, following review of the record, the court agreeing with Judge Mehalchick’s recommendation, and concluding that there is no clear error on the face of the record, it is hereby

ORDERED that:

1. The report (Doc. 15) of Magistrate Judge Mehalchick is ADOPTED.
2. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in favor of Evanitus and against the Commissioner as set forth in the following paragraph.
3. The Commissioner’s decision is VACATED and this matter is REMANDED to the Commissioner with instructions to conduct a new administrative hearing, develop the record fully, and evaluate the evidence appropriately in accordance with this order and the report (Doc. 15) of Magistrate Judge Mehalchick.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge  
United States District Court  
Middle District of Pennsylvania