

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA, FLORENCE DIVISION

Amanda S. v. Commissioner of the Social Security Administration

Amanda S. · No. 4:25-cv-12593-JDA · Decided May 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina reviews a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation in an action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) challenging the denial of disability insurance benefits. Because neither party objected, the Court reviewed the Report for clear error, accepted it, reversed the Commissioner’s decision, and remanded the matter for further administrative proceedings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacquelyn D. Austin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
DECIDED	May 12, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-cv-12593-JDA
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's final decision denying Plaintiff's claim for disability insurance benefits; the court reviewed and adopted the magistrate judge's unobjected-to Report and Recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	In the absence of specific objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the Report for clear error rather than conducting de novo review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court opinion; precedential status is not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Amanda S. v. Commissioner of the Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

civil procedure

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

Administrative Law

Civil Procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation for clear error when neither party filed objections.
2. Whether the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits should be reversed and remanded for further administrative proceedings under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely specific objection is filed, the district court need not conduct de novo review and instead reviews the Report and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record.
2. The Commissioner's decision is reversed and the case is remanded under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative action consistent with the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. The Commissioner issued a final decision denying the claim, and Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) challenging the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, who recommended reversal and remand for further administrative review. Neither party objected, and the district court reviewed the Report for clear error, accepted it, reversed the Commissioner's decision under sentence four of § 405(g), and remanded for further proceedings.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative action consistent with the findings of the Report and Recommendation.

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION Amanda S.,*) Case No. 4:25-cv-12593-JDA) Plaintiff,))
v.) OPINION AND ORDER) Commissioner of the Social Security) Administration,))
Defendant.)) This matter is before the Court on an action brought by Plaintiff pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security Administration (the “Commissioner”) denying her claim for disability insurance benefits pursuant to the Social Security Act.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers, III for pre-trial proceedings. On April 23, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the Commissioner’s decision be reversed and remanded for further administrative review.

[Doc. 21.] The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if they failed to do so. [Id. at 13.] Neither party has filed objections, and the time to do so has lapsed. * The Committee on Court Administration and Case Management of the Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended that due to significant privacy concerns in social security cases, federal courts should refer to claimants only by their first names and last initials.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976).

The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only

satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Having done so, the Court accepts the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference.

Accordingly, the decision of the Commissioner is REVERSED pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and this matter is REMANDED to the Commissioner for further action consistent with the findings of the Report and Recommendation. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin United States District Judge May 12, 2026 Florence, South Carolina