

**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

OPINION

Hull

PER CURIAM.

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