

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, LOUISVILLE DIVISION

Alex Kemper Hull v. Commissioner of Social Security

Hull · No. 3:25-cv-108-RGJ-RSE · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky accepts and incorporates the magistrate judge’s recommendation affirming the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of Alex Kemper Hull’s claim for disability insurance benefits. Because no objections were filed, the court conducted its own review, found no error, and ordered that a separate judgment issue.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, Louisville Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, Louisville Division
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-108-RGJ-RSE
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Social Security claimant sought judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying disability insurance benefits. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, whose report and recommendation recommended affirmance. No objections were filed, and the district court accepted and incorporated the recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court must conduct de novo review of any portion of a magistrate judge's disposition to which a specific objection is properly made. When no specific objection is filed, the court need not conduct de novo or other review and may adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings; the court nevertheless conducted its own review and found no error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Alex Kemper Hull v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court could accept the magistrate judge's report and recommendation without de novo review when no party filed objections.
2. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation to affirm the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits should be accepted.

HOLDINGS

1. When no party files a specific objection to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court may accept the recommendation without conducting de novo or other review.
2. The court accepted and incorporated the magistrate judge's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation in whole, thereby affirming the Commissioner's final decision denying Hull's claim for disability insurance benefits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"This Court must "determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to.""

"The Court need not review under a de novo or any other standard those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no specific objection is made and may adopt the findings and rulings of the magistrate judge to which no specific objection is filed"

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hull sought disability insurance benefits from the Social Security Administration. The Commissioner issued a final decision denying the claim, and Hull challenged that decision in federal district court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hull filed a complaint challenging the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits. After briefing, Magistrate Judge Regina S. Edwards issued a report and recommendation on December 17, 2025, recommending that the Commissioner's decision be affirmed. Hull filed no objections by the January 2, 2026 deadline, so the district court accepted the recommendation in whole and ordered that a separate judgment issue.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150, 155 (1985)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY LOUISVILLE
DIVISION ALEX KEMPER HULL, Plaintiff v. Civil Action No. 3:25-cv-108-RGJ-RSE
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY Defendant * * * * * ORDER ACCEPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION This matter is before the Court on the Complaint filed by
Plaintiff Alex Kemper Hull (“Hull”) challenging the final decision of the Commissioner of Social
Security (“Commissioner”) denying his claim for disability insurance benefits.

[DE 1]. Hull filed a Brief and Fact and Law Summary [DE 10, DE 11], and the Commissioner
filed a Fact and Law Summary [DE 15]. This matter was referred to United States Magistrate
Judge Regina S. Edwards for report and recommendation. [DE 9]. Judge Edwards entered her
Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendation [DE 17] on December 17, 2025,
recommending that the final decision of the Commissioner be affirmed.

The time for objections to the magistrate judge’s recommendation expired on January 2, 2026. See
28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). Hull did not file objections and the time for
doing so has passed. This matter is now ripe for adjudication. A district court may refer a motion
to a magistrate judge for the preparation of a report and recommendation.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(1). “A magistrate judge must promptly conduct the
required proceedings... [and] enter a recommended disposition, including, if appropriate, proposed
findings of fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(1). This Court must “determine de novo any part of the
magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed.

R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The Court need not review under a de novo or any other standard those aspects
of the report and recommendation to which no specific objection is made and may adopt the
findings and rulings of the magistrate judge to which no specific objection is filed Thomas v. Arn,
474 U.S. 140, 150, 155 (1985).

Here, because no party has objected to the Report and Recommendation, the Court may accept it
without review. See Thomas, 474 U.S. at 150, 155. Nevertheless, the Court has conducted its own
review of the record and finds no error in the magistrate judge’s findings and conclusions.

Accordingly, and the Court being otherwise sufficiently advised, IT ORDERED as follows: (1)
The Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate
Judge Regina S. Edwards, [DE 17], is ACCEPTED in whole and INCORPORATED by reference.

(2) A separate judgment shall issue this date. United States District Court January 7, 2026 ce:
Counsel of Record

