

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

Olanda Tyler,	)	Civil Action No. 2:14-cv-04755-JMC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Commissioner of Social Security	)	
Administration,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the court for a review of United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), filed on August 1, 2016 (ECF No. 18), recommending that the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (the “Commissioner”) denying Olanda Tyler’s (“Plaintiff”) claims for a period of disability and disability benefits (“DIB”) and Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”) be remanded. The Report sets forth the relevant facts and legal standards which this court incorporates herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge’s Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a) for the District of South Carolina. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court, which has no presumptive weight. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *Id.* The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made. *Id.*

The parties were advised of their right to file objections to the Report by August 18, 2016. (*See* ECF No. 18.) Plaintiff did not file any objections. The Commissioner filed a Notice of

Not Filing Objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge on August 18, 2012. (ECF No. 20.)

In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report, 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) (explaining that a judge may “accept, reject, or modify in whole or in part [a] [M]agistrate [Judge’s] report,” without explanation, when no objections are filed by the challenging party). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a [D]istrict [C]ourt 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).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court finds the Report provides an accurate summary of the facts and law and does not contain any clear error. The court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 18) and **REMANDS** the case to the Commissioner for further proceedings consistent with this decision.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "J. Michelle Childs". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

United States District Judge

September 12, 2016  
Columbia, South Carolina