

**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.

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