

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

Lonzell Townsend v. Commissioner of Social Security

Case No. 3:25-cv-1149 · No. 3:25-cv-1149 · Decided March 31, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation after no party filed objections within the prescribed fourteen-day period. The court affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision denying Lonzell Townsend’s application for Supplemental Security Income and closed the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Western Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeffrey J. Helmick
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Western Division
DECIDED	March 31, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-1149
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Review of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending affirmance of the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of Supplemental Security Income benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviewed the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation under the applicable objection and waiver procedure and adopted it after no timely objections were filed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Lonzell Townsend v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when neither party filed timely objections.
2. Whether the Commissioner's decision denying Townsend's application for Supplemental Security Income should be affirmed.

HOLDINGS

1. Failure to file objections to the Report and Recommendation within the specified fourteen-day period constitutes a waiver of subsequent review under Local Rule 72.3(b).
2. The Commissioner's decision denying Townsend's application for Supplemental Security Income is affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"I consider their failure to file objections to "constitute a waiver of subsequent review," Local R. 72.3(b), and adopt Judge Henderson's R & R in its entirety as the final Order of this Court."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Townsend applied for Supplemental Security Income, and the Commissioner of Social Security denied the application. A magistrate judge recommended affirming that denial, and neither party objected within the prescribed fourteen-day period.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Carmen E. Henderson issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the court affirm the Commissioner's decision denying Townsend's application for Supplemental Security Income. The parties were given fourteen days to object, but neither party filed objections. The district court adopted the Report and Recommendation in its entirety, affirmed the Commissioner's decision, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- *Berkshire v. Beauvais*, 928 F.3d 520, 530-31 (6th Cir. 2019)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION Lonzell Townsend, Case No. 3:25-cv-1149 Plaintiff, v. ORDER AND

JUDGEMENT ENTRY Commissioner of Social Security, Defendant. On December 19, 2025, United States Magistrate Judge Carmen E. Henderson issued a Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) recommending I affirm the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision denying Plaintiff’s application for Supplemental Security Income.

(Doc. No. 12). In the R & R, she notified the parties: Any objections to this Report and Recommendation must be filed with the Clerk of Courts within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy of this document. Failure to file objections within the specified time may forfeit the right to appeal the District Court’s order. See *Berkshire v. Beauvais*, 928 F. 3d 520, 530-31 (6th Cir.

2019). (Id. at 13). More than fourteen days passed, and no party filed any objection to the R & R. I consider their failure to file objections to “constitute a waiver of subsequent review,” Local R. 72.3(b), and adopt Judge Henderson’s R & R in its entirety as the final Order of this Court.

The Commissioner’s decision is affirmed, and this case is closed. So Ordered. s/ Jeffrey J. Helmick United States District Judge