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

Anthony Wayne Sheppard, Plaintiff, v. Nancy A. Berryhill, Commissioner of Social Security Administration, Defendant.	)	C/A No. 4:17-1877-CMC **OPINION & ORDER**

Through this action, Plaintiff seeks judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying his claim for Disability Insurance Benefits ("DIB") and Supplemental Security Income ("SSI"). Plaintiff appealed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g). The matter is currently before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation ("Report") of Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rules 73.02(B)(2)(a) and 83.VII.02, *et seq.*, D.S.C.

The Report, filed on August 30, 2018, recommends that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. ECF No. 48. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if they failed to do so. No objections have been filed and the time for doing so has passed.

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 the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *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).

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 adopts and incorporates the Report by reference.[1] For the reasons set forth therein, the decision of the Commissioner is affirmed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina
September 24, 2018

[1] The court notes the Report includes a typographical error on page 27, when it refers to Plaintiff as "she." Other than this one instance, the Report correctly refers to Plaintiff as "he" throughout. Therefore, it is clear this is merely a typographical error.