

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

Deloris Ann Grant,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
Nancy A. Berryhill,)
Acting Commissioner of the)
Social Security Administration,)
)
Defendant.)
_____)

Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-3304-BHH

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Deloris Ann Grant’s (“Plaintiff”) complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of the Commissioner of Social Security’s final decision, which denied Plaintiff’s claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. The record includes the report and recommendation (“Report”) of a United States Magistrate Judge, which was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C. In the Report, which was filed on January 24, 2018, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court affirm the Commissioner’s decision because Plaintiff failed to show that the Commissioner’s decision was not based on substantial evidence. In a notice filed on February 6, 2018, Plaintiff informed the Court that she will not be filing objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the 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 only of those portions of the Report to

which specific objections are 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 the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “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.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Finding none, the Court hereby adopts and incorporates the Report (ECF No. 29). Therefore, it is **ORDERED** that the Commissioner’s decision denying benefits is affirmed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
The Honorable Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States District Judge

February 7, 2018
Charleston, South Carolina