

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

Johnny L. Proctor,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No. 3:11-2139-TLW-JRM
)	
Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of Social)	
Security Administration,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

Plaintiff brought this action pursuant to 205(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Defendant, Commissioner of Social Security, denying his claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the decision of the Commissioner be reversed and that the case be remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative action consistent with the recommendation, pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and 1383(c)(3). (Doc. # 27). The Commissioner has filed a notice that he will not file objections to the Report. (Doc. # 30).

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge,

this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 27). The Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED** under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) and the case is **REMANDED** to the Commissioner for further administrative action as outlined in the Report.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

November 20, 2012
Florence, South Carolina