

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

Leroy B. Altman, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Michael J. Astrue, )  
 Commissioner of Social Security, )  
 )  
 Defendant. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

C/A No. 2:11-2380-TMC

**OPINION and ORDER**

This matter is before the court for a review of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”) filed on December 7, 2012, recommending that the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“the Commissioner”) denying Plaintiff’s claim for Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”) be affirmed, pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). (Dkt. # 15).

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).

No objections have been filed by the Plaintiff or Commissioner, and the time for filing objections has expired. Thus, the matter is ripe for consideration by this court.

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 and careful review of the record, the court adopts the Report of the Magistrate Judge which is incorporated herein by reference. The Commissioner's final decision denying benefits in this case is **AFFIRMED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
January 4, 2013