

**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

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-middle-district-of-tenn/2026/renada-bridges-v-frank-bisignano-commissioner-of-social-h5yg1h00>