

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
NORTH CAROLINA, NORTHERN DIVISION

Seanise N. Webb v. Frank J. Bisignano, Commissioner of Social
Security

Webb · No. 2:24-CV-00055-M-RN · Decided February 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina overruled Seanise N. Webb’s objections to a magistrate judge’s Memorandum and Recommendation in a Social Security disability case. The court declined to consider medical documents submitted for the first time in the objection and denied the motion to supplement. It adopted the recommendation, affirmed the Commissioner’s final decision, granted the Commissioner’s request for relief, and closed the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, Northern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Richard E. Myers II
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, Northern Division
DECIDED	February 13, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-CV-00055-M-RN
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff objected to a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation recommending affirmance of the Commissioner's final Social Security disability decision. The district court reviewed the objections, denied a motion to supplement with materials not presented to the ALJ, adopted the recommendation, and affirmed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court conducts de novo review of portions of a magistrate judge's recommendation to which specific and timely objections are made, and reviews unobjected portions for clear error. In reviewing a Social Security disability determination, the court asks whether the ALJ applied the correct legal standards and whether substantial evidence supports the factual findings. The court may not reweigh

	conflicting evidence, make credibility determinations, or substitute its judgment for the ALJ's.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential
PARTIES	Seanise N. Webb v. Frank J. Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

agency adjudication

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's objections to the magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation were sufficiently specific and particularized to require de novo review.
2. Whether the district court could consider medical documents submitted with Plaintiff's objections or motion to supplement that were not presented to the ALJ.
3. Whether the ALJ applied the correct legal standards and supported the Social Security disability determination with substantial evidence.
4. Whether the magistrate judge accurately described the ALJ's factual and procedural findings and properly recommended affirmance.

HOLDINGS

1. Objections must be specific and particularized and direct the district court to a specific error; general and conclusory objections do not trigger de novo review, and unobjected portions are reviewed for clear error.
2. In reviewing an ALJ's factual findings, the district court may not consider evidence that was not presented to the ALJ.
3. The Commissioner's final disability determination must be upheld because the ALJ applied the correct legal standards and substantial evidence supported the ALJ's findings.
4. The ALJ properly evaluated Plaintiff's subjective symptom statements by determining that her impairments could produce the alleged symptoms and then assessing the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of those symptoms against the entire record.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A reviewing court must uphold a Social Security disability determination if "(1) the ALJ applied the correct legal standards and (2) substantial evidence supports the ALJ's factual findings."" (983 F.3d at 94)

“The court has reviewed the remaining portions of the M&R and the record, and finding no clear error, ADOPTS the recommendation of the magistrate judge as its own.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought Social Security disability benefits based in part on osteoarthritis, radiculopathy, and related pain and functional limitations. The ALJ found that Plaintiff had medically determinable impairments capable of producing her alleged symptoms but that her statements concerning the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of those symptoms were not entirely consistent with the medical evidence. The ALJ determined that Plaintiff retained the capacity for a reduced range of light work, relying in part on activities including leaving home, preparing simple meals, shopping, driving, managing finances, and performing household chores.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Robert T. Numbers, II, who issued a Memorandum and Recommendation recommending that the Commissioner's final decision be affirmed. Plaintiff filed objections and later moved to supplement them with additional medical documents. The district court overruled the objections, denied the motion to supplement, adopted the M&R, granted the Commissioner's request for relief, denied Plaintiff's request for relief, affirmed the Commissioner's decision, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- *Elijah v. Dunbar*, 66 F.4th 454, 459 (4th Cir. 2023)
- *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 271 (1976)
- *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)
- *United States v. Midgette*, 478 F.3d 606, 621 (4th Cir. 2007)
- *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)
- *Arakas v. Commissioner, Social Security Administration*, 983 F.3d 83, 94-95 (4th Cir. 2020)
- *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971)
- *Pierce v. Underwood*, 487 U.S. 552, 565 (1988)
- *Smith v. Chater*, 99 F.3d 635, 638 & n.5 (4th Cir. 1996)
- *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)