



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

DETRA STANETTE JONES,
Plaintiff,

§

vs.

§

§

§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:16-0376-MGL

§

NANCY A. BERRYHILL,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,
Defendant.

§

§

§

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND REVERSING AND REMANDING THE CASE TO DEFENDANT
FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

This is a Social Security appeal in which Plaintiff seeks judicial review of a final decision of Defendant denying her claims for Disability Insurance Benefits (DIB) and Supplemental Social Security (SSA). The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting to the Court the decision be reversed and remanded to Defendant under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further consideration. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (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 with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on February 15, 2017, and Defendant filed her notice that she did not intend to file any objections to the Report on March 1, 2017. “[I]n 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). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this action is hereby **REVERSED AND REMANDED** to Defendant under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further consideration as set forth in the Report.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 1st day of March, 2017, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE