

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
 at WINCHESTER

DAWN LUGENE MCCOLLUM,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	Case No. 4:14-cv-66
v.)	
)	Judge Mattice
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,)	Magistrate Judge Steger
)	
<i>Defendant.</i>)	
)	

ORDER

On February 25, 2016, United States Magistrate Christopher H. Steger filed his Report and Recommendation (Doc. 15) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). Magistrate Judge Steger recommended that (1) Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 10) be denied; (2) Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 11) be granted; (3) the Decision of the Commissioner be affirmed; and (4) this action be dismissed.¹

Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.² Nevertheless, the Court has conducted a reviewed the Report and

¹ Although he did not specifically make a recommendation regarding Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend her Motion for Summary Judgment in order to correct a typographical error regarding her age and date of birth, Magistrate Judge Steger incorporated the correct birthdate and age into his recitation of the facts. (See Doc. 13; Doc. 15 at 3). Thus, the Court will assume that Magistrate Judge Steger intended to recommend that Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend be granted.

² Magistrate Judge Steger 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 her right to appeal. (Doc. 15 at 23 n.5); 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 now expired.

