

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO, WESTERN DIVISION

Mason D. S. v. Commissioner of the Social Security Administration

Mason D. S. · No. 1:25-cv-40 · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio adopted the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation in a Social Security disability benefits action. The court overruled the plaintiff’s Statement of Errors, affirmed the Commissioner’s non-disability determination, and dismissed the case from the court’s docket.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan J. Dlott
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-40
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's denial of Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income. After the magistrate judge recommended affirmance and plaintiff filed no objections, the district court adopted the Report and Recommendation and dismissed the action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed whether the ALJ applied the correct legal standards and whether the ALJ's findings were supported by substantial evidence. Because no objections were filed to the Report and Recommendation, de novo review was not required, although the district court reviewed and agreed with the recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Mason D. S. v. Commissioner of the Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ erred at step three by failing to evaluate Listing 12.05 and by finding that plaintiff did not meet or equal Listings 12.04, 12.06, 12.10, or 12.11.
2. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's evaluation of plaintiff's subjective symptoms.
3. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the medical opinion evidence and prior administrative findings.
4. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no timely objections were filed.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ did not reversibly err in evaluating the Listings, plaintiff's subjective symptoms, or the medical opinion and prior administrative-finding evidence, and the Commissioner's non-disability determination was supported by substantial evidence.
2. When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation on a dispositive matter, the district court is not required to conduct de novo review of the recommendation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Undersigned agrees with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that the Statement of Errors be overruled and the Commissioner's non-disability determination be affirmed." (PageID 612)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged disability beginning February 8, 2022, based on autism spectrum disorder, ADHD, anxiety, major depressive disorder, mood disorder, encephalopathy, and related limitations. The ALJ found several severe impairments but determined that none met or medically equaled a listed impairment. The ALJ assigned an RFC for work at all exertional levels subject to substantial nonexertional restrictions and concluded, based on vocational-expert testimony, that jobs existed in significant numbers in the national economy that plaintiff could perform.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff applied for DIB and SSI, alleging disability beginning February 8, 2022. The applications were denied initially and on reconsideration, and an ALJ issued an unfavorable decision on January 31, 2024. The Appeals Council denied review on December 4, 2024. Plaintiff filed this action on January 31, 2025, and later asserted errors concerning the Listings, subjective symptoms, and opinion evidence. The magistrate judge recommended

affirming the Commissioner's decision; plaintiff filed no timely objections, and the district court adopted the recommendation.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Howard v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 276 F.3d 235, 239 (6th Cir. 2002)
- Blakley v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 581 F.3d 399, 406 (6th Cir. 2009)
- Baker v. Peterson, 67 F. App'x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985)
- Weir v. Centurion, No. 3-19-CV-00131, 2021 WL 5165930, at *1 (M.D. Tenn. Nov. 5, 2021)
- Mira v. Marshall, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam)