

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
at GREENEVILLE

BETTY SUSAN JORDON,	)	
	)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	)	
	)	Case No. 2:16-cv-322
v.	)	
	)	Judge Mattice
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,	)	Magistrate Judge Corker
	)	
<i>Defendant.</i>	)	
	)	

**ORDER**

On November 30, 2017, United States Magistrate Judge Clifton L. Corker filed a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 17) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Corker recommended that Plaintiff’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (Doc. 13) be denied, and Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 15) be granted.

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

Accordingly, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Corker’s findings of fact and conclusions of law. Plaintiff’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (Doc. 13) is hereby **DENIED**, Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 15) is hereby **GRANTED**, and this action is hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

---

<sup>1</sup> Magistrate Judge Corker specifically advised Plaintiff that she 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. 17 at 17 n. 10); *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”).

**SO ORDERED** this 5th day of January, 2018.

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