

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

William Deleon Neptune, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Commissioner of the )  
 Social Security Administration, )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 Defendant. )

Civil Action No. 4:14-cv-03319-JMC

**ORDER**

This matter is before the court for a review of the United States Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”) (ECF No. 23) recommending that the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (the “Commissioner”) denying Plaintiff’s claim for Disability Insurance Benefits be reversed and remanded for further administrative proceedings. The Report sets forth the relevant facts and legal standards which this court incorporates herein without a recitation.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court that has no presumptive weight—the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court reviews *de novo* only those portions of a Magistrate Judge’s Report to which specific objections are filed, and it reviews those portions not objected to—including those portions to which only “general and conclusory” objections have been made—for clear error. *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005); *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983); *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). The court may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the

recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2012).

The role of the federal judiciary in the administrative scheme the Social Security Act established is a limited one. Section 405(g) of the Act provides, “[T]he findings of the Commissioner of Social Security as to any fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive . . . .” 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) (2012). “Substantial evidence has been defined innumerable times as more than a scintilla, but less than a preponderance.” *Thomas v. Celebrezze*, 331 F.2d 541, 543 (4th Cir. 1964).

This standard precludes a *de novo* review of the factual circumstances that substitutes the court’s findings for those of the Commissioner. *See Vitek v. Finch*, 438 F.2d 1157 (4th Cir. 1971). The court instead must uphold the Commissioner’s decision as long as it is supported by substantial evidence. *See Blalock v. Richardson*, 483 F.2d 773, 775 (4th Cir. 1972). “From this [requirement] it does not follow, however, that the findings of the administrative agency are to be mechanically accepted. The statutorily granted right of review contemplates more than an uncritical rubber stamping of the administrative agency.” *Flack v. Cohen*, 413 F.2d 278, 279 (4th Cir. 1969). “[T]he courts must not abdicate their responsibility to give careful scrutiny to the whole record to assure that there is a sound foundation for the [Commissioner’s] findings, and that this conclusion is rational.” *Vitek*, 438 F.2d at 1157–58.

In this case, the Magistrate Judge advised the parties of their right to file objections to the Report by January 8, 2016. (*See* ECF No. 23.) Defendant filed a Reply indicating no intention of filing objections. (ECF No. 25 at 1.)

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). 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).

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. The court **ADOPTS** the findings of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 23), **REVERSES** the final decision of the Commissioner denying Plaintiff’s claim for Disability Insurance Benefits, and **REMANDS** the case to the Commissioner for further proceedings consistent with this decision pursuant to sentence four (4) of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

**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

January 27, 2016  
Columbia, South Carolina