IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Bobby Larue Jackson Plaintiff, v. Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, Defendant.	)	C.A. No. 0:09-cv-02931-JMC ORDER

This social security matter is before the court for a review of the Report and Recommendation issued by the Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Civil Rule 83.VII.02, DSC. Plaintiff, Bobby Larue Jackson, brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §405(g) to obtain judicial review of the final decision of Defendant Commissioner of the Social Security Administration ("Commissioner") denying his claim for supplemental security income and disability insurance benefits. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc.# 15], filed on January 7, 2011, recommends that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. The Report and Recommendation sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards on this matter, and the court incorporates the Magistrate Judge's recommendation herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber, 423* U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections are made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the Magistrate Judge's recommendation or

recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff was advised of his right to file objections to the Report and Recommendation [Doc. # 15, at 11]. However, Plaintiff filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation.

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report and Recommendation results in a party's waiver of the right to appeal from the judgment of the District Court based upon such recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and Recommendation and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. # 15]. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ J. Michelle Childs
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
February 1, 2011