

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

ROCHELLE LUCILLE CAREY,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:13-CV-00040
	§	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	§	
SECURITY OFFICE,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	


**ORDER ADOPTING  
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Complaint (D.E. 1), appealing the social security disability decision of the Commissioner of Social Security, along with the parties' Briefs (D.E. 5, 6). On October 7, 2013, United States Magistrate Judge B. Janice Ellington issued a Memorandum and Recommendation (D.E. 7), recommending that the Commissioner's decision that Plaintiff is not disabled be affirmed. The parties were provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Recommendation. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been filed.

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation. *Guillory v. PPG Industries, Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Services Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Recommendation (D.E. 7), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Commissioner's determination that Plaintiff is not disabled is **AFFIRMED**.

ORDERED this 4th day of November, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NELVA GONZALES RAMOS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE