

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

**William Lamm v. Frank J. Bisignano, Commissioner of Social
Security**

Lamm · No. No. 5:24-CV-617-D · Decided February 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina adopts a magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation in a Social Security case. Because neither party objected and the court found no clear error, it remands the matter to the Commissioner of Social Security for further proceedings.

OPINION

Lamm

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
WESTERN DIVISION

No. 5:24-CV-617-D

WILLIAM LAMM,)

Plaintiff, v. ORDER

FRANK J. BISIGNANO,

Commissioner of Social Security,) Defendant. On October 31, 2024, William Lamm ("Lamm" or "plaintiff") filed a complaint against the Commissioner of Social Security [D.E. 1]. On April 9, 2025, plaintiff filed a Social Security brief [D.E. 11]. On May 9, 2025, defendant responded [D.E. 13]. On May 23, 2025, plaintiff replied. [D.E. 15]. On September 12, 2025, the court referred the matter to a United States Magistrate: Judge for a memorandum and recommendation [D.E. 17]. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). On January 5, 2026, Magistrate Judge Robert B. Jones, Jr. issued a memorandum and recommendation ("M&R") [D.E. 18]. In the M&R, Magistrate Judge Jones recommended that the court remand the matter for further consideration. See *id.* at 12. "The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge's report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (cleaned up); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond*, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation

omitted). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see *United States v. Midgette*, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007). Neither party objected to the M&R. Therefore, the court reviews for clear error. The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See *Diamond*, 416 F.3d at 315. In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 18]. The court REMANDS the case for further proceedings. SO ORDERED. This & day of February, 2026.

J S C. DEVER III

United States District Judge