

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

PATTY JOE STUMP,

Plaintiff,

v. // CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:16CV238
(Judge Keeley)

NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [DKT. NO. 15], DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. NO. 12], AND
GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. NO. 13]

On December 20, 2016, the plaintiff, Patty Joe Stump ("Stump"), filed a complaint against the defendant, the Acting Commissioner of Social Security ("Commissioner") (Dkt. No. 1). Stump sought review of the Commissioner's final decision denying her applications for Disability Insurance Benefits ("DIB") and Supplemental Security Income ("SSI") due to degenerative disc disease of the lumbar spine, hypertension, kidney infection, obesity, cauda equina syndrome, low IQ, and incontinence. Id. at 1-2. According to Stump, the Commissioner's decision denying her benefits "is not supported by substantial evidence." Id. at 3. The Commissioner answered the complaint and filed the administrative record on March 24, 2017 (Dkt. Nos. 9, 10).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 and the local rules, the matter was referred to the Honorable James E. Seibert, United States Magistrate Judge for initial review.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [DKT. NO. 15], DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. NO. 12], AND
GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. NO. 13]

In a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") dated August 30, 2017, Magistrate Judge Seibert recommended that the Court deny Stump's motion for summary judgment and grant the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 15). Following a careful review of the record, he concluded that the Administrative Law Judge's decision to deny benefits was supported by substantial evidence.

The R&R informed the parties of their right to file "written objections identifying the portions of the Report and Recommendations to which objection is made, and the basis for such objection." Id. at 10. It further warned that failure to do so would result in waiver of the right to appeal. Id. Despite receipt of the R&R, neither party filed objections to the recommendation.

"The Court will review de novo any portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is made...and the Court may adopt, without explanation, any of the magistrate judge's recommendations to which the prisoner does not object." Dellacirprete v. Gutierrez, 479 F. Supp. 2d 600, 603-04 (N.D.W. Va. 2007) (citing Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983)). Failure to file specific objections waives appellate review of both factual and legal questions. See United States v.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [DKT. NO. 15], DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. NO. 12], AND GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. NO. 13]

Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984); see also Moore v. United States, 950 F.2d 656, 659 (10th Cir. 1991).

Having received no objections to the R&R, the Court has no duty to conduct a de novo review of Magistrate Judge Seibert's findings. Furthermore, following a review of the R&R and the record for clear error, the Court:

- 1) **ADOPTS** the R&R (Dkt. No. 15);
- 2) **DENIES** Stump's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 12);
- 3) **GRANTS** the Commissioner's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 13); and
- 4) **DISMISSES** this civil action **WITH PREJUDICE** and **DIRECTS** that it be stricken from the Court's active docket.

It is so **ORDERED**.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58, the Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to enter a separate judgment order and to transmit copies of both orders to counsel of record.

Dated: February 14, 2018.

/s/ Irene M. Keeley
IRENE M. KEELEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE