

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
MISSISSIPPI, NORTHERN DIVISION

Katina Tagert White v. Commissioner of Social Security

White · No. 3:25-CV-649-KHJ-MTP · Decided May 18, 2026

OPINION

White

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

NORTHERN DIVISION

KATINA TAGERT WHITE PLAINTIFF

V. CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:25-CV-649-KHJ-MTP

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL DEFENDANT

SECURITY

ORDER

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Michael T. Parker’s [18] Report and Recommendation. R. & R. [18]. The [18] Report recommends reversing the Commissioner of Social Security Administration’s final decision and remanding the case. at 1. In January 2022, plaintiff Katina Tagert White (“White”) applied for disability insurance benefits. Admin. R. [10] at 206–14. The agency denied her application, so an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) conducted two hearings in 2024 and found that White was not disabled. at 19–34. White appealed the ALJ’s decision, but the Appeals Council denied her request for review. at 6. Thus, the ALJ’s decision became the Commissioner’s final decision. Now, White seeks judicial review in this Court under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). [1]. The [18] Report finds that the ALJ’s analysis of White’s medical records contains factual inaccuracies about White’s range of motion in her lumbar spine.

[18] at 13. The ALJ relied on those factual errors, and the correct information could have impacted the ALJ’s decision. at 15. So the [18] Report recommends reversing the Commissioner’s final decision and remanding the action to the Commission for further administrative proceedings. at 16. Written objections to the [18] Report were due by May 12, 2026. The

[18] Report notified the parties that failure to file written objections by that date would bar further appeal in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636. No party objected to the [18] Report, and the time to do so has passed. The Court must review de novo a magistrate judge’s report only when a party objects to the report within 14 days after being served with a copy. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). When no party timely objects to the report, the Court applies “the ‘clearly

erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law' standard of review.” , 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam). Finding the [18] Report neither clearly erroneous, contrary to law, nor an abuse of discretion, the Court adopts the [18] Report, reverses the Commissioner's final decision, and remands this action to the Commissioner for further administrative proceedings consistent with this order and the [18] Report. In doing so, the Court has considered all arguments raised. Those arguments not addressed would not have altered the Court's decision. SO ORDERED, this 18th day of May, 2026. s/

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE