

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, NASHVILLE DIVISION

Renada Bridges v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

Bridges · No. 3:25-cv-00324 · Decided March 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation in Renada Bridges’s Social Security disability benefits case. Because neither party objected and the court found no clear error, it denied Bridges’s motion for judgment on the administrative record and directed entry of final judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division
DECIDED	March 27, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-00324
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the denial of disability insurance benefits and moved for judgment on the administrative record. The Magistrate Judge recommended denying the motion in a Report and Recommendation. Neither party objected, and the District Court reviewed the recommendation for clear error, adopted it, and denied Plaintiff's motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is made to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court need only determine whether there is clear error on the face of the record. In reviewing the denial of disability insurance benefits, the court applies the deferential substantial-evidence standard to the Administrative Law Judge's findings.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Renada Bridges v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability benefits

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Report and Recommendation should be accepted when neither party filed a timely objection.
2. Whether the Administrative Law Judge's denial of disability insurance benefits was supported by substantial evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation.
2. The Administrative Law Judge's findings were supported by substantial record evidence; therefore, the denial of disability insurance benefits was upheld and Bridges's motion for judgment on the administrative record was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Where, as here, there are no “timely objection[s]” to the R&R, “the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”” (Doc. No. 15 at 17)

““The district court is not required to review—under a de novo or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made.”” (Doc. No. 15 at 17)

““[I]f substantial evidence supports the ALJ’s decision, this Court defers to that finding even if there is substantial evidence in the record that would have supported an opposite conclusion.”” (Doc. No. 15 at 17)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Social Security Administration denied Renada Bridges's claim for disability insurance benefits. An Administrative Law Judge made findings adverse to Bridges, and the Magistrate Judge concluded that those findings were supported by substantial record evidence. The District Court reviewed and adopted that recommendation after finding no clear error.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation on March 12, 2026, recommending denial of Renada Bridges's motion for judgment on the record. The parties were given fourteen days to object, but neither filed an objection. The District Court found no clear error, agreed that the Administrative Law Judge's findings

were supported by substantial record evidence, approved and adopted the R&R, denied the motion, and ordered entry of final judgment.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ashraf v. Adventist Health Sys./Sunbelt, Inc., 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)
- Blakley v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 581 F.3d 399, 406 (6th Cir. 2009)

OPINION

Bridges

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

NASHVILLE DIVISION

RENADA BRIDGES,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) No. 3:25-cv-00324) FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner of) Social Security)
) Defendant.)

ORDER

On March 12, 2026, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. No. 15) in this social security case recommending that the Court deny Renada Bridges’ motion for judgment on the record (Doc. No. 7). The Magistrate Judge informed the parties that any objections to the R&R must be filed within fourteen (14) days of service. (Doc. No. 15 at 17). Neither party filed any objections. Where, as here, there are no “timely objection[s]” to the R&R, “the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note to 1983 amendment (citations omitted); see also Ashraf v. Adventist Health Sys./Sunbelt, Inc., 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018) (citing Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)) (“The district court is not required to review—under a de novo or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made.”). Having carefully reviewed the R&R, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. Specifically, in light of the deferential standard of review applicable to denials of disability insurance benefits, the Court agrees that the Administrative Law Judge’s findings are supported by substantial record evidence. See Blakley v. Comm’r Of Soc. Sec., 581 F.3d 399, 406 (6th Cir. 2009) (citation and quotation marks omitted) (“[I]f substantial evidence supports the ALJ’s decision, this Court defers to that finding even if there is substantial evidence in the record that would have supported an

opposite conclusion.”); (Doc. No. 15 at 8, 13, 17). Accordingly, the R&R (Doc. No. 15) is APPROVED AND ADOPTED. Bridges’ Motion for Judgment Based on the Administrative Record (Doc. No. 7) is DENIED. This is a final order. The Clerk of the Court shall enter a final judgment in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58 and close this file. IT IS SO ORDERED. Wau. Qubed ale inst
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE