

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
at WINCHESTER

ROY WAYNE WARNER,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	Case No. 4:13-cv-00046
v.)	
)	Judge Mattice
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY)	
)	Magistrate Judge Lee
<i>Defendant.</i>)	
)	

ORDER

On July 3, 2014, United States Magistrate Judge Susan K. Lee filed her Report and Recommendation (Doc. 16) 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 Judgment on the Pleadings (Doc. 12) be denied; (2) Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 14) be granted; and the Decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. (Doc. 16 at 22).

The parties have not filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.¹ Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed *de novo* the record in this matter, and it agrees with the Magistrate Judge'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 Judgment on the Pleadings (Doc. 12) is **DENIED**;

¹ 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. 45); *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").

Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 14) is **GRANTED**; the decision of the Commissioner is **AFFIRMED**; and the case is hereby **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

SO ORDERED this 5th day of August, 2014.

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