

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN

Dominique M. v. Commissioner of Social Security

Dominique M. · No. 2:24-cv-12706 · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan adopted a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation in a Social Security appeal. The court denied the plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment, granted the Commissioner’s motion for summary judgment, affirmed the administrative law judge’s decision, and closed the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan K. DeClercq
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-12706
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Social Security appeal in which the district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation addressing cross-motions for summary judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For an unobjected-to report and recommendation, the parties forfeited their right to appeal the magistrate judge's findings, and the district court reviewed the report for prejudicial clear error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Dominique M. v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security
- administrative law
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's report and recommendation when no party filed objections.
2. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to summary judgment overturning the Social Security administrative law judge's decision.
3. Whether the Commissioner's motion for summary judgment should be granted and the ALJ's decision affirmed.

HOLDINGS

1. A party that fails to file timely objections forfeits the right to appeal the magistrate judge's findings; the district court may review the unobjected-to report for prejudicial clear error.
2. The report and recommendation should be adopted because no party objected and the court found no prejudicial clear error.
3. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment was denied, Defendant's motion for summary judgment was granted, and the ALJ's decision was affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"This is a final order and closes the above-captioned case."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case arose from Plaintiff's challenge to a Social Security administrative law judge's decision. The magistrate judge recommended affirming the ALJ's decision and entering judgment for the Commissioner. The district court found no prejudicial clear error and adopted that recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Kimberly G. Altman recommended denying Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, granting Defendant's motion for summary judgment, and affirming the administrative law judge's decision. No party filed objections within the allotted fourteen days. The district court adopted the report and recommendation, denied Plaintiff's motion, granted Defendant's motion, affirmed the ALJ's decision, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- *Berkshire v. Dahl*, 928 F.3d 520, 530–31 (6th Cir. 2019)
- *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985)

OPINION

Michanowicz

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DOMINIQUE M.1,

Plaintiff, Case No. 2:24-cv-12706 v. Honorable Susan K. DeClercq United States District Judge

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL

SECURITY, Honorable Kimberly G. Altman United States Magistrate Judge Defendant.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF No. 13),
DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF
No. 9), GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT (ECF No. 11), AND AFFIRMING DECISION OF
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

On February 3, 2026, Magistrate Judge Kimberly G. Altman issued a report recommending that this Court deny Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment, ECF No. 9, grant Defendant’s motion for summary judgment, ECF No. 11, and affirm the administrative law judge’s (ALJ) decision in this social security appeal. ECF No. 13. 1 Consistent with guidance regarding privacy concerns in Social Security cases by the Judicial Conference Committee on Court Administration and Case Management, the Eastern District of Michigan has adopted a policy to identify plaintiffs in Social Security cases by only their first names and last initials. See also FED. R. CIV. P. 5.2(c)(2)(B). Judge Altman provided 14 days for objections to be filed, but no party filed objections. They have therefore forfeited their right to appeal Judge Altman’s findings. See *Berkshire v. Dahl*, 928 F.3d 520, 530–31 (6th Cir. 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985)). Moreover, there is no prejudicial clear error in the report. Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 13, is ADOPTED. Further, it is ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 9, is DENIED. Further, it is ORDERED that Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 11, is GRANTED. Further, it is ORDERED that the decision of the ALJ in this case is AFFIRMED. IT IS SO ORDERED. This is a final order and closes the above-captioned case. /s/Susan K. DeClercq

SUSAN K. DeCLERCQ

United States District Judge Dated: February 19, 2026