

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
at CHATTANOOGA

COURTNEY HOLMES,	)	
	)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	)	
	)	Case No. 1:12-cv-324
v.	)	
	)	Judge Mattice
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,	)	Magistrate Judge Lee
	)	
<i>Defendant.</i>	)	
	)	

**ORDER**

On August 27, 2013, United States Magistrate Judge Susan K. Lee filed her Report and Recommendation (Doc. 10) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Lee recommended that (1) Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 6) be denied; (2) Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 8) be granted; (3) the Decision of the Commissioner be affirmed; and (4) this action be dismissed.

Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the Court has conducted a reviewed the Report and Recommendation, as well as the record, and it agrees with Magistrate Judge Lee’s well-reasoned conclusions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Magistrate Judge Lee specifically advised Plaintiff that he had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive his right to appeal. (Doc. 10 at 21 n.1); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”). Even taking into account the three additional days for service provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), the period in which Plaintiff could timely file any objections has long since expired.

Accordingly:

- The Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Lee's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations pursuant to § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b);
- Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 6) is **DENIED**;
- Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 8) is **GRANTED**;
- The decision of the Commissioner is **AFFIRMED**; and
- This case is hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

**SO ORDERED** this 20th day of November, 2013.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.  
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE