

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

|  |             |                                 |
|--|-------------|---------------------------------|
| Maketia Clark,   | )           | Civil Action No.: 8:11-2585-MGL |
|  | )           |                                 |
| Plaintiff,   | )           |                                 |
|  | )           |                                 |
| v.   | )           | <b><u>OPINION AND ORDER</u></b> |
|  | )           |                                 |
| Michael J. Astrue,<br>Commissioner of Social Security, | )<br>)<br>) |                                 |
| Defendant.   | )           |                                 |

---

Plaintiff Maketia Clark (“Plaintiff”) brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) to obtain judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying her claim for Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin for pretrial handling. On December 14, 2012, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which she determined that the Commissioner’s decision was supported by substantial evidence. (ECF No. 27.) Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommended that the Commissioner’s decision be affirmed. On December 20, 2012, Plaintiff filed a “Notice of Not Filing Objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.” (ECF No. 28.)

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 her with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). 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).

The court has carefully reviewed the record and concurs in the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. The court adopts the Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference. For the reasons set forth herein and in the Report and Recommendation, the decision of the Commissioner to deny benefits is **AFFIRMED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Mary G. Lewis  
United States District Judge

January 14, 2013  
Spartanburg, South Carolina