

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA

Shannon S. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security
Administration

Shannon S. · No. 0:24-cv-07565 · Decided January 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The court adopts the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation, which recommended reversing the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision concerning the plaintiff’s claim for Supplemental Security Income. The court reverses the Commissioner’s decision under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and remands the matter for further proceedings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sherri A. Lydon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina
DECIDED	January 28, 2026
DOCKET	0:24-cv-07565
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying or otherwise adjudicating Plaintiff's claim for Supplemental Security Income. The court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge's unobjected-to Report and Recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation. Specific objections would require de novo review of the challenged portions under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; persuasive but not generally binding beyond the case.
PARTIES	Shannon S. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

remedies

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

federal civil procedure

judicial review

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no party filed objections.
2. Whether the Commissioner's final decision should be reversed and the case remanded for further proceedings under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed, the district court may accept the magistrate judge's recommendation after satisfying itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record.
2. The Commissioner's decision is reversed and the matter is remanded for further proceedings consistent with the Report and Recommendation under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Shannon S. brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) challenging the Commissioner's final decision regarding her claim for Supplemental Security Income. The magistrate judge recommended that the Commissioner's decision be reversed and the matter remanded for further proceedings. The district court reviewed the Report, applicable law, and record and found no clear error.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff sought review of the Commissioner's final decision concerning her Supplemental Security Income claim. Magistrate Judge Paige Jones Gossett recommended reversal and remand under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). No objections were filed, and the district court found no clear error, adopted the Report and Recommendation, reversed the Commissioner's decision, and remanded for further proceedings.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter is remanded for further proceedings consistent with the magistrate judge's 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

Simpson

PER CURIAM.

Plaintiff, v.

ORDER

Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security Administration, Defendant. 12Shannon S. (“Plaintiff”) brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) regarding her claim for Supplemental Security Income. On January 13, 2026, Judge Paige Jones Gossett issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the court reverse the decision of the Commissioner and remand this matter for further proceedings under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). [ECF No. 20.] Objections to the Report were due on January 27, 2026. No objections have been filed. 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 this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Without objections, the court need not provide an explanation for adopting the Report and must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order 1 The Committee on Court Administration and Case Management of the Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended due to significant privacy concerns in social security cases that federal courts refer to claimants only by their first name and last initials in court opinions. 2 Frank Bisignano was sworn in as the Social Security Commissioner on May 7, 2025. Under Fed. to accept the recommendation.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). After a thorough review of the Report, the applicable law, and the record of this case in accordance with the above standard, the court finds no clear error, adopts the Report, ECF No. 20, and incorporates the Report by reference herein. Accordingly, the court REVERSES the decision of the Commissioner under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and REMANDS this matter for further proceedings consistent with the Report. IT IS SO ORDERED. January 28, 2026 Sherri A. Lydon Columbia, South Carolina United States District Judge 2

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-south-carolina-united-states-district-court-for-the/2026/shannon-s-v-frank-bisignano-commissioner-of-social-security-4g5pwwro>