

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
EL PASO DIVISION**

<b>JONATHAN FULLER,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>v.</b>	§	<b>CAUSE NO. EP-23-CV-417-KC-MAT</b>
	§	
<b>COMMISSIONER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Defendant.</b>	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On this day, the Court considered the case. Pursuant to Paragraph 2(c) of the Court’s May 1, 2012, Standing Order, this case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Miguel A. Torres. On February 18, 2025, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), ECF No. 15, which recommended that the Court vacate the decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (“Commissioner”) denying Plaintiff’s claim for disability insurance benefits and remand the case for further proceedings. *Id.* at 1, 18.

Parties have fourteen days from service of a Report and Recommendation of a United States Magistrate Judge to file written objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).<sup>1</sup> Over fourteen days have elapsed since all parties were served with the R&R, and no objections have been filed.

When parties do not file written objections, courts apply a “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law” standard of review to a report and recommendation. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (stating this standard of review “is appropriate only where there has been no objection to the magistrate’s ruling”); *Rodriguez v.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal district courts conduct de novo review of those portions of a report and recommendation to which a party has objected. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) (“A judge . . . shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report . . . to which objection is made . . .”).

*Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276–77 (5th Cir. 1988) (“[A] party is not entitled to de novo review of a magistrate’s finding and recommendations if objections are not raised in writing by the aggrieved party . . . after being served with a copy of the magistrate’s report.”), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). After reviewing the R&R, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and finds they are neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. *See Wilson*, 864 F.2d at 1221.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R, ECF No. 15, in its entirety and **ORDERS** that the Commissioner’s decision is **VACATED**, and the case is **REMANDED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

**SIGNED this 7th day of March, 2025.**

  
KATHLEEN CARDONE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE