

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO, WESTERN DIVISION

Paige C. v. Commissioner of Social Security

Paige C. · No. 1:25-cv-00072 · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation after no objections were filed. The Court grants the plaintiff’s Statement of Errors, reverses the Commissioner’s non-disability determination, and remands the matter to the Social Security Administration under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael R. Barrett
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division
DECIDED	January 9, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00072
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's non-disability determination. The matter came before the district court on the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, to which no party filed timely objections.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Paige C. v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- agency adjudication
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security law
- administrative law
- federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation when no timely objections were filed.
2. Whether the Commissioner's non-disability determination should be reversed and the matter remanded under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the Report and Recommendation because the parties received proper notice and filed no timely objections.
2. The Commissioner's non-disability determination was reversed, and the case was remanded to the Social Security Administration for further consideration under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); the district court made no finding whether Plaintiff was disabled.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns Plaintiff's challenge to the Commissioner's determination that she was not disabled under the Social Security Act. The district court did not make its own finding regarding whether Plaintiff was disabled and instead remanded the matter for further consideration consistent with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation on December 23, 2025. After finding that the parties had received proper notice and had filed no objections within the applicable period, the district court adopted the R&R, granted Plaintiff's Statement of Errors, reversed the Commissioner's non-disability determination, and remanded the matter to the Social Security Administration under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter is remanded to the Social Security Administration under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further consideration consistent with the Decision and Order. The court made no finding regarding whether Plaintiff was disabled.

CASES CITED

- United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981)

OPINION

Casavant

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Paige C.,¹ Plaintiff, v. Case No. 1:25-cv-00072 Commissioner of Social Security, Defendant.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) filed by the Magistrate Judge on December 23, 2025 (Doc. 12). Proper notice has been given to the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), including notice that the parties may forfeit rights on appeal if they failed to file objections to the R&R in a timely manner. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). No objections to the Magistrate Judge’s R&R (Doc. 12) have been filed and the time to do so has expired. Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the R&R (Doc. 12) of the Magistrate Judge is hereby ADOPTED. Consistent with the recommendation by the Magistrate Judge:

1. Plaintiff’s Statement of Errors (Doc. 7) is GRANTED;
2. The Court REVERSES the Commissioner’s non-disability determination;
3. No finding is made as to whether Plaintiff was under a “disability” within the meaning of the Social Security Act; 1 See S.D. Ohio General Order 22-01 (“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.”). 1
4. This matter is REMANDED to the Social Security Administration under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further consideration consistent with this Decision and Order; and
5. This case is terminated on this Court’s docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED. s/Michael R. Barrett Michael R. Barrett, Judge United States District Court

2