

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

Danyell Cruell,

PLAINTIFF

v.

Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of  
Social Security,

DEFENDANT

Case No. 2:15-cv-3377-TLW

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Danyell Cruell brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying her claim for Title II disability benefits and Title XVI supplemental security income. ECF No. 1. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (R&R) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Baker to whom this case was previously assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC. ECF No. 13. In the R&R, the Magistrate Judge recommends affirming the Commissioner's denial of benefits. Plaintiff filed objections to the R&R and the Commissioner replied. ECF Nos. 15, 16. This matter is now ripe for decision.

In reviewing the R&R, 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).

After a careful review of the R&R, the objections filed by Plaintiff, and the record related to the R&R and the objections, this Court accepts the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that the decision of the Administrative Law Judge is supported by substantial evidence. In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, Plaintiff's objections are overruled and the R&R is accepted. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner's decision is AFFIRMED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten  
Chief United States District Judge

March 8, 2017  
Columbia, South Carolina