

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court opinion; precedential status is not stated in the opinion.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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-south-carol/2026/amanda-s-v-commissioner-of-the-social-security-18gss8fs>