

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, ROCK ISLAND DIVISION

Deanna T. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

Deanna T. · No. 4:25-cv-4088-SLD-RLH · Decided June 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation in a Social Security disability case. Because neither party objected, the court reviewed the recommendation for clear error and found none. The court affirmed the Commissioner’s decision denying Deanna T.’s application for supplemental security income and directed the clerk to enter judgment and close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Rock Island Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sara Darrow
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Rock Island Division
DECIDED	June 16, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-cv-4088-SLD-RLH
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, whose Report and Recommendation recommended affirmance. Neither party objected, and the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviewed the unobjected portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation for clear error. The underlying administrative decision was reviewed to determine whether it was supported by substantial evidence and based on the proper legal standard.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Deanna T. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should review the unobjected-to portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation for clear error.
2. Whether the magistrate judge properly recommended affirming the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income where the ALJ's decision was supported by substantial evidence and applied the proper legal standard.

HOLDINGS

1. When no party objects to a magistrate judge's recommended disposition, the district judge reviews the unobjected portions for clear error.
2. The court found no clear error in the Report and Recommendation's review of the ALJ's decision, adopted the Report and Recommendation, and affirmed the Commissioner's decision.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The ALJ does not have "to provide a complete and written evaluation of every piece of testimony and evidence, but must build a logical bridge from the evidence to his conclusion.""

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

In April 2022, Deanna T. applied for supplemental security income based on an alleged disability beginning February 7, 2021. The Commissioner denied the application, and an ALJ determined that she was not disabled under the Social Security Act. The Appeals Council did not review the matter, so the ALJ's decision became the Commissioner's final decision.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Deanna T. applied for supplemental security income, alleging disability beginning February 7, 2021. The Social Security Administration denied the application, and an administrative law judge found that she was not disabled under the Social Security Act. The Appeals Council denied review, making the ALJ's decision the Commissioner's final decision. Magistrate Judge Ronald L. Hanna recommended affirmance, and the district court adopted the recommendation after finding no clear error.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp., 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999)
- Musonera v. Saul, 410 F. Supp. 3d 1055, 1058 (E.D. Wis. 2019)
- Jozefyk v. Berryhill, 923 F.3d 492, 496 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Lopez ex rel. Lopez v. Barnhart, 336 F.3d 535, 539 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Rice v. Barnhart, 384 F.3d 363, 369 (7th Cir. 2004)
- Minnick v. Colvin, 775 F.3d 929, 935 (7th Cir. 2015)

OPINION

Temple

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

ROCK ISLAND DIVISION

DEANNA T.,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Case No. 4:25-cv-4088-SLD-RLH) FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner of)
Social Security)) Defendant.)

ORDER

In April 2022, Plaintiff Deanna T. filed an application for supplemental security income for a disability that she claims began on February 7, 2021. R. 196.1 The Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (“the Commissioner”) denied her application, and Deanna seeks judicial review of this decision pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and 42 U.S.C. § 1383(c)(3). See generally Compl., ECF No. 1. Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Ronald L. Hanna’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), ECF No. 13, which recommends affirming the Commissioner’s decision. When a dispositive matter is referred to a magistrate judge, he must enter a recommended disposition. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(1). After being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, parties have fourteen days to object to the proposed findings and recommendations. Id. 72(b)(2). The district judge must determine de novo any portions of the recommended disposition that were properly objected to. Id. 72(b)(3). If no objection, or only partial objection, is made, the district judge reviews the unobjected portions of the recommendation for clear error. Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp., 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999). Upon this review, 1 The record of proceedings before the Social Security Administration can be found at ECF Nos. 6 through 6-10. the district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition or return it to the magistrate judge for further proceedings. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Because neither party objected to any portion of Judge Hanna’s R&R, the Court reviews it for clear error. In this case, an administrative law judge (“ALJ”) found that Deanna was not disabled under the terms of the Social Security Act. See R. 207. The Appeals Council (“AC”) did not review the matter, R. 1, so the ALJ’s decision became the Commissioner’s decision. See

Musonera v. Saul, 410 F. Supp. 3d 1055, 1058 (E.D. Wis. 2019) (“Ordinarily, when the AC denies review, the court evaluates the ALJ’s decision as the final word of the Commissioner.” (citing Jozefyk v. Berryhill, 923 F.3d 492, 496 (7th Cir. 2019))). In his R&R, Judge Hanna recommends affirming the ALJ’s decision. R&R 1. His review of the decision was limited to determining whether it is supported by substantial evidence and based on the proper legal standard. Id. at 3–4; see 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); Lopez ex rel. Lopez v. Barnhart, 336 F.3d 535, 539 (7th Cir. 2003). “Evidence is substantial when it is sufficient for a reasonable person to conclude that the evidence supports the decision.” Rice v. Barnhart, 384 F.3d 363, 369 (7th Cir. 2004). The ALJ does not have “to provide a complete and written evaluation of every piece of testimony and evidence, but must build a logical bridge from the evidence to his conclusion.” Minnick v. Colvin, 775 F.3d 929, 935 (7th Cir. 2015) (quotation marks omitted). After reviewing the R&R, the parties’ submissions, the administrative record, and the applicable law, the Court finds no clear error in the R&R’s review of the ALJ’s decision. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation, ECF No. 13, is ADOPTED and the Commissioner’s decision in this matter is AFFIRMED pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The Clerk is directed to enter judgment and close the case. Entered this 16th day of June, 2026. s/ Sara Darrow

SARA DARROW

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE