

part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions.
See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Further, Defendant has filed a Notice that it will not be filing objection to the Report and Recommendation. [Doc/ # 26.] In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *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.’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

ORDERED that the Commissioner’s decision is REVERSED pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and that the case is REMANDED to the Commissioner for further administrative action as set forth in the Report and Recommendation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
August 28, 2012