## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE at GREENEVILLE

FREDERICK ARLEN RENFRO,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Case No. 2:12-cv-00008
V.	)	
	)	Judge Mattice
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY	)	
- A	)	Magistrate Judge Lee
Defendant.	)	
	)	

## **ORDER**

On October 17, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge Susan K. Lee filed her Report and Recommendation (Doc. 26) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Lee recommended that Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees be granted and that Plaintiff's counsel be awarded attorney's fees in the amount of \$10,886.50, and that the previously awarded EAJA fee of \$2,263.50 be refunded to Plaintiff. (*Id.*).

The parties have not filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed *de novo* the record in this matter, and it agrees with Magistrate Judge Lee's well-reasoned conclusions.

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 Attorney's Fees is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's counsel is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Magistrate Judge Lee specifically advised the parties that they had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive the right to appeal the district court's order. (Doc. 26 at 5 n.4); 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").

attorney's fees in the amount of \$10,886.50, and the previously awarded EAJA fee of \$2,263.50 be credited to Plaintiff.

**SO ORDERED** this 7th day of January, 2015.

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