

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

Cornell Paige)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No.: 4:15-cv-0115-TLW
)	
v.)	
)	
Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,)	ORDER
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Cornell Paige (“Plaintiff”) brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Defendant, Acting Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”), denying his claims for Disability Insurance Benefits. (ECF No. 1). This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed on April 20, 2016 by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), DSC. (ECF No. 20). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends affirming the Commissioner’s decision. On May 5, 2016, Plaintiff filed a notice that he did not have objections to the Report. (ECF No. 22). The matter is now ripe for disposition.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “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 & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and concludes that it accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. The Court notes that Plaintiff filed no objections. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report is **ACCEPTED**. (ECF No. 20). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner’s decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten

TERRY L. WOOTEN
Chief United States District Judge

July 25, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina