

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
ARKANSAS

Bret Anthony v. Commissioner, Social Security Administration

Anthony · No. 1:25-cv-01028 · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas adopted a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation concluding that the Administrative Law Judge's denial of Social Security benefits was not supported by substantial evidence. The court reversed the Commissioner's decision and remanded the case for further proceedings under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan O. Hickey
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01028
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's denial of Social Security benefits. The court reviewed and adopted a magistrate judge's unobjected-to Report and Recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviewed the unobjected-to Report and Recommendation for clear error and reviewed the ALJ's decision for support by substantial evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Bret Anthony v. Commissioner, Social Security Administration

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- remedies
- attorney fees
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security
- administrative law
- civil procedure
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation in the absence of objections and upon finding no clear error.
2. Whether the Commissioner's denial of Social Security benefits should be reversed because the ALJ's decision was not supported by substantial evidence.
3. Whether the case should be remanded to the Commissioner under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

HOLDINGS

1. The court adopted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation in toto after finding no clear error on the face of the record and concluding that the magistrate judge's reasoning was sound.
2. The Commissioner's decision denying benefits was reversed because the ALJ's decision was not supported by substantial evidence.
3. The matter was remanded to the Commissioner for further proceedings pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This matter is hereby REMANDED to the Commissioner of Social Security for further proceedings pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Administrative Law Judge denied Bret Anthony's claim for Social Security benefits. The magistrate judge determined that the ALJ's denial was not supported by substantial evidence. The district court adopted that determination and remanded the matter to the Commissioner for further proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Administrative Law Judge denied Plaintiff's application for benefits. Magistrate Judge Spencer G. Singleton concluded that the ALJ's decision was not supported by substantial evidence and recommended reversal and remand. No objections were filed, and the district court found no clear error, adopted the Report and Recommendation in full, reversed the Commissioner's decision, and remanded under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter is remanded to the Commissioner of Social Security for further proceedings pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

CASES CITED

- *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 296 (1993)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS EL DORADO DIVISION BRET ANTHONY PLAINTIFF v. Case No. 1:25-cv-01028 COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION DEFENDANT ORDER Before the Court is a Report and Recommendation filed on January 8, 2026, by the Honorable Spencer G. Singleton, United States Magistrate Judge for the Western District of Arkansas.

(ECF No. 13). Judge Singleton found that the decision of the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) denying benefits to Plaintiff is not supported by substantial evidence and therefore recommends that the Court reverse and remand Plaintiff’s case. No party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation, and the time to object has passed. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Upon review, finding no clear error on the face of the record and that Judge Singleton’s reasoning is sound, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 13) in toto. Accordingly, judgment is hereby entered in favor of Plaintiff, and the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security in this matter is REVERSED. This matter is hereby REMANDED to the Commissioner of Social Security for further proceedings pursuant to Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

Additionally, if Plaintiff wishes to request an award of attorney’s fees and costs under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, an application may be filed up to thirty (30) days after the judgment becomes “non appealable” (i.e., thirty (30) days after the sixty (60) day time for appeal has ended). See *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 296 (1993); 28 U.S.C. §§ 2412(d)(1)(B), (d)(2) (G).

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 19th day of February, 2026. /s/ Susan O. Hickey Susan O. Hickey
United States District Judge