

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
MICHIGAN**

**Andree S. v. Commissioner of Social Security**

Andree S. · No. 2:25-cv-10592 · Decided February 24, 2026

---

**OPINION**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION ANDREE S.1, Plaintiff, Case No. 2:25-cv-10592 v. Honorable Susan K. DeClercq United States District Judge SOCIAL SECURITY, COMMISSIONER OF, Honorable Elizabeth A. Stafford Defendant. United States Magistrate Judge \_\_\_\_\_/ ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF No. 12), GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 9), DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 11), AND REMANDING MATTER On January 27, 2026, Magistrate Judge Elizabeth A. Stafford issued a report, ECF No. 12, recommending that this Court grant Plaintiff Andree S.’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 9, and deny Defendant Commissioner of Social Security’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 11.

Accordingly, Judge Stafford’s report recommended that this Court remand the matter for further 1 Consistent with guidance regarding privacy concerns in Social Security cases by the Judicial Conference Committee on Court Administration and Case Management, the Eastern District of Michigan has adopted a policy to identify plaintiffs in Social Security cases by only their first names and last initials.

See also FED. R. CIV. P. 5.2(c)(2)(B). consideration under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). ECF No. 12 at PageID.1429. Judge Stafford provided 14 days to object. Id. at PageID.1430. But the Parties did not do so. They have therefore forfeited their right to appeal Judge Stafford’s findings. See *Berkshire v. Dahl*, 928 F.3d 520, 530–31 (6th Cir. 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)).

Moreover, having reviewed the report and recommendation, this Court will adopt the recommendation in full because it finds no clear error. See *Roby v. Bloom Roofing Sys*, 343 F.R.D. 487, 490 (E.D. Mich. 2023) (noting that a clearly erroneous finding is one that leaves this Court with a firm and definite conviction that the magistrate judge made a mistake).

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 12, is ADOPTED. It is further ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 9, is GRANTED. It is further ORDERED that Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No.

11, is DENIED. It is further ORDERED that the matter is REMANDED for further consideration under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

IT IS SO ORDERED. This is a final order and closes the above-captioned case. /s/Susan K. DeClercq SUSAN K. DeCLERCQ United States District Judge Dated: February 24, 2026