

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

Leland Howard Grim, Jr., )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
Nancy A. Berryhill, Acting Commissioner )  
of Social Security Administration, )  
)  
Defendant. )

Civil Action No. 2:15-3698-TMC

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, Leland Howard Grim, Jr., brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”)<sup>1</sup> denying his claim for Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”) under the Social Security Act (“SSA”). (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the court affirm the Commissioner’s decision to deny DIB. (ECF No. 16). On February 8, 2017, Plaintiff filed a notice of his intent not to file any objections to the Report. (ECF No. 17). Further, the Commissioner has not filed any objections to the Report, and the time to do so has run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-

---

<sup>1</sup> Nancy A. Berryhill became the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration on January 27, 2017. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d), Berryhill should be substituted for Carolyn W. Colvin as the defendant in this action.

71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *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).

Having conducted the required review, the court finds no clear error. Therefore, the court adopts the Report (ECF No. 16), and the Commissioner’s final decision is **AFFIRMED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
February 16, 2017