

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

Stanley Green,)	C/A No. 0:16-cv-2860-CMC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	OPINION & ORDER
Nancy A. Berryhill,)	
Acting Commissioner of Social Security)	
Administration,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

Through this action, Plaintiff seeks judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Plaintiff’s claim for Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”). Plaintiff appealed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g). The matter is currently before the court on Defendant’s motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint for lack of jurisdiction. ECF No. 11. Plaintiff filed a notice on March 14, 2017, stating that he would not file any opposition to Defendant’s motion to dismiss.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rules 73.02(B)(2)(a) and 83.VII.02, et seq., D.S.C, this motion was referred to Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for a Report and Recommendation (“Report”). The Report, filed on March 15, 2017, recommends this action be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. ECF No. 13. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report and his time for doing so has passed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). 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, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “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.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

The court has reviewed the record, motion and response, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Finding none, the court adopts and incorporates the Report by reference. For the reasons set forth therein, this matter is dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina
March 30, 2017