

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

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 énd 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, Cç.*, 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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-nor/2026/william-lamm-v-frank-j-bisignano-commissioner-of-social-lttj8ev2>