IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

| | |
|---|---|
| Allyson E. Martini-Roth,<br><br>PLAINTIFF<br><br>v.<br><br>Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,<br><br>DEFENDANT | Case No. 1:14-cv-04683-TLW<br><br>**Order** |

This social security matter now comes before the Court for review of the lengthy and detailed Report and Recommendation ("R&R") filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. In the R&R, the magistrate judge recommends affirming the Commissioner's decision denying Plaintiff's claims for Supplemental Security Income. ECF No. 22. Plaintiff filed objections to the R&R, ECF No. 24, and the Commissioner filed a response to the objections, ECF No. 25. This matter is now ripe for decision.

In reviewing the magistrate judge's recommendation, the Court applies the following standard:

> The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections . . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

*Wallace v. Hous. Auth. of City of Columbia*, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations

omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has carefully reviewed, *de novo*, the R&R, the objections, and the record relevant to these filings. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the R&R, ECF No. 22, is **ACCEPTED**. Plaintiff's objections, ECF No. 24, are **OVERRULED**, and the Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED** for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**.

*s/ Terry L. Wooten*
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

September 27, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina