

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

Gregory S. Elliott,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 5:14-3542-TMC
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting	)	
Commissioner of Social Security	)	
Administration,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

Plaintiff Gregory S. Elliott (“Elliott”) brought this action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying his claim for Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”) benefits under the Social Security Act. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the United States Magistrate Judge, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civ. Rule 73.02 (D.S.C.). (ECF No. 21). The Report recommends that the Commissioner’s decision be reversed and remanded pursuant to sentence four of § 405(g) for further proceedings consistent with the Report. *Id.* Plaintiff has not filed any objections to the Report, and on September 11, 2015, the Commissioner filed a notice of her intent not to file any objections to the Report (ECF No. 23).

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *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 and careful review of the record, the court adopts the Report of the Magistrate Judge which is incorporated herein by reference. The Commissioner’s final decision is **REVERSED and REMANDED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative review as set forth in the Report. (ECF No. 21).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

September 22, 2015  
Anderson, South Carolina