

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

Enrico Renaldo Taffi v. Commissioner of Social Security

Taffi · No. 5:25-cv-00040 · Decided March 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning Enrico Renaldo Taffi’s challenge to the denial of Period of Disability and Disability Insurance Benefits. Because no timely objections were filed and the court found no clear error, it affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David A. Ruiz
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 12, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-00040
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought district-court review of the Commissioner of Social Security's final decision denying his application for a Period of Disability and Disability Insurance Benefits. The magistrate judge recommended affirmance, and the district court reviewed and adopted the Report and Recommendation after Plaintiff filed no objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When a party properly objects to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the challenged portions de novo. When no timely objections are filed, the district court need only determine whether there is clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation. In the Sixth Circuit, failure to object constitutes forfeiture.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Enrico Renaldo Taffi v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

administrative law

social security benefits

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no timely objections are filed?
2. Whether the Report and Recommendation recommending affirmance of the Commissioner's denial of benefits should be adopted after review for clear error.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objections are filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation.
2. The court found no clear error in the Report and Recommendation, adopted it, and affirmed the Commissioner's decision denying Plaintiff's application for benefits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation."

"In the Sixth Circuit, failure to object constitutes a forfeiture."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff applied for a Period of Disability and Disability Insurance Benefits. The Commissioner issued a final decision denying the application, which Plaintiff challenged in the district court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed his Complaint on January 1, 2025, challenging the Commissioner's denial of benefits. Magistrate Judge Amanda M. Knapp issued a Report and Recommendation on December 19, 2025, recommending that the Commissioner's decision be affirmed. Plaintiff filed no timely objections, so the district court reviewed the record for clear error, adopted the Report and Recommendation, and affirmed the Commissioner's decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Campbell v. United States Dist. Court, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974), cert. denied, 419 U.S. 879
- Schuster v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 2022 WL 219327, at *1 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 25, 2022)
- Berkshire v. Beauvais, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-oh/2026/enrico-renaldo-taffi-v-commissioner-of-social-security-tlzh1fwl>