

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA**

Sherrie B. v. Frank Bisignano

Sherrie B. v. Bisignano, Civil Action No. 5:25-cv-00264 (S.D. W. Va. Apr. 17, 2026) · No. 5:25-cv-00264 ·

Decided April 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopts a magistrate judge's PF&R in a Social Security action. The court denies the plaintiff's request for judgment on the pleadings, grants the Commissioner's request to affirm the decision, affirms the Commissioner's decision, and dismisses the case after no objections were filed.

OPINION

Booth

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

AT BECKLEY

SHERRIE B.,

Plaintiff, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:25-cv-00264

FRANK BISIGNANO,

Commissioner of Social Security, Defendant.

ORDER

Pending is Plaintiff Sherrie B.'s Request for Judgment on the Pleadings [Doc. 8], filed July 21, 2025. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Joseph K. Reeder, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Reeder filed his PF&R on March 10, 2026. Magistrate Judge Reeder recommended that the Court deny Plaintiff's request for judgment on the pleadings, grant Defendant's request to affirm the Commissioner's decision, affirm the Commissioner's decision, dismiss this action, and remove it from the docket. The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." (emphasis added)). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. See 28 U.S.C. §

636(b)(1); see also *United States v. De Leon- Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (Parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge’s findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn’t require de novo review absent objection.”); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on March 27, 2026. No objections were filed. Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the PF&R [Doe. 11], DENIES Plaintiff’s request for judgment on the pleadings [Doc. 8], GRANTS Defendant’s request to affirm the Commissioner’s decision [Doc. 9], AFFIRMS the decision of the Commissioner, DISMISSES this matter, and REMOVES it from the docket. The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party. ENTER: April 17, 2026 ©: W. Volk “Tae” Chief United States District Judge