

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Poff v. Commissioner of Social Security

No. 3:25-CV-00308 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 10, 2026) · No. 3:25-CV-00308 · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning Nicole L. Poff’s challenge to the denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits. The court affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision, entered judgment for the defendant, and directed the clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Matthew W. Brann
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-CV-00308
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Poff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits. The magistrate judge recommended affirmance, and the district court reviewed and adopted that recommendation after no timely objections were filed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is made to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation for clear error, while retaining authority to accept, reject, or modify the recommendation. The Commissioner's decision is upheld if supported by substantial evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Nicole L. Poff 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 magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation should be adopted when no timely objections were filed.
2. Whether the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits was supported by substantial evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court may review the magistrate judge's recommendation for clear error and, finding no error, may adopt the recommendation.
2. The Commissioner's decision denying Poff's claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits is supported by substantial evidence and is affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Upon review of the record, the Court finds no error in Magistrate Judge Caraballo's conclusion that the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence." (Order)

"The Commissioner's decision is AFFIRMED;" (Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Nicole L. Poff applied for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits. The Commissioner of Social Security denied her claim, and Poff filed an action seeking judicial review of that denial.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 13, 2026, Magistrate Judge Phillip J. Caraballo issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Commissioner's decision be affirmed. No timely objections were filed. The district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error, found no error, adopted the Report and Recommendation, affirmed the Commissioner's decision, entered final judgment for the Commissioner, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987)

OPINION

Poff

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

NICOLE L. POFF, No. 3:25-CV-00308

Plaintiff, (Chief Judge Brann) v. (Magistrate Judge Caraballo)

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL

SECURITY,

Defendant.

ORDER

MARCH 10, 2026

Nicole L. Poff filed this action seeking review of a decision by the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying Poff’s claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits.¹ On January 13, 2026, Magistrate Judge Phillip J. Caraballo issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court affirm the Commissioner’s decision.² No timely objections were filed to this report and recommendation. Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.³ Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in

¹ Docs. 1, 13.

² Doc. 17.

³ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; see *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge).⁴ Upon review of the record, the Court finds no error in Magistrate Judge Caraballo’s conclusion that the Commissioner’s decision is supported by substantial evidence. Consequently, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Magistrate Judge Phillip J. Caraballo’s Report and Recommendation

(Doc. 17) is ADOPTED;

2. The Commissioner’s decision is AFFIRMED;

3. Final Judgment is entered in favor of Defendant and against Poff

pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 and sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); and

4. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case.

BY THE COURT: s/ Matthew W. Brann Matthew W. Brann Chief United States District Judge 4
28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.