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

Linda Jean Clark, Plaintiff, v. Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of Social Security, Defendant.	)	Civil Action No.: 5:15-1397-MGL **ORDER**

Plaintiff Linda Jean Clark, ("Plaintiff"), brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Defendant, Commissioner of Social Security ("Commissioner"), denying her claim for Disability Insurance Benefits ("DIB") and Supplemental Security Income ("SSI") under the Social Security Act. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West for pretrial handling. On April 18, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, ("Report"), concluding that the findings of the Administrative Law Judge, ("ALJ"), were supported by substantial evidence and recommending that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. (ECF No. 21). Plaintiff filed an Objection to the Report on April 21, 2016, (ECF No. 23), to which the Commissioner replied on March 5, 2016. (ECF No. 26). The matter is now ripe for review and decision by this Court.

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. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). 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).

In light of the standards set forth above, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the entire record, including, in particular, the Report and Plaintiff's Objection. In her Objection, Plaintiff largely restates arguments already advanced in prior submissions, and none of Plaintiff's contentions meaningfully counter the core legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge's analysis, including the Magistrate Judge's findings that substantial evidence supported the ALJ's Step 2 and Step 4 analyses and that the ALJ properly analyzed Plaintiff's credibility.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court concurs with the reasoning of the Magistrate Judge and adopts the Report and incorporates it herein by reference, (ECF No. 21), overruling Plaintiff's Objection. (ECF No. 23). The decision of the Commissioner is thereby **AFFIRMED.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Mary G. Lewis
United States District Judge

May 9, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina