

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

Samuel D. Floyd,	)	Civil Action No. 3:12-987-MGL
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
v.	)	
	)	
Michael J. Astrue,	)	
Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

---

In this action, Plaintiff Samuel D. Floyd (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, seeks judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying Plaintiff’s claim for Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”) and Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”). Plaintiff filed his complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”). The matter is currently before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C. filed on March 22, 2013. (ECF No. 39). In the Report, Magistrate Judge McCrorey set forth the relevant standards of law and facts related to this case. For the reasons set forth below, the court adopts the Report and affirms the Commissioner’s decision.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter

to him with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). 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).

The well-reasoned Report recommends that the Commissioner’s decision be affirmed. No objections have been filed to the Magistrate Judge’s Report. Absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir.1984), *cert. denied*, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984).

The court has carefully reviewed the record and concurs in the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Thus, the court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. The decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Mary G. Lewis  
United States District Judge

Spartanburg, South Carolina  
April 30, 2013