

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Timmy C. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

Timmy C. v. Bisignano · No. 2:25-cv-00322 · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopted the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendation in a Social Security disability case. The court denied the plaintiff’s request to reverse the Commissioner’s decision, granted the Commissioner’s request to affirm, affirmed the final decision, and dismissed the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00322
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The plaintiff sought review of the Commissioner of Social Security's final decision. After a magistrate judge issued proposed findings and a recommendation to affirm the Commissioner and dismiss the action, neither party timely objected. The district court adopted the recommendation, affirmed the Commissioner's decision, and dismissed the action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no party objects to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation, the district court is not required to conduct de novo or any other review of the unobjected-to factual or legal conclusions and may adopt the recommendation without explanation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; the source identifies the matter as a district-court memorandum opinion and order and provides no precedential-status designation.
PARTIES	Timmy C. 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 was required to conduct de novo or other review of the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendation when neither party timely objected.
2. Whether the court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation, affirm the Commissioner's final decision, and dismiss the action.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objections are filed, the district court is not required to review de novo or under any other standard the magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions and may adopt the proposed findings and recommendation without explanation.
2. The plaintiff's request to reverse the Commissioner's decision was denied, the Commissioner's request to affirm was granted, the Commissioner's final decision was affirmed, and the action was dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed." (1)

"Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the Proposed Findings and Recommendation, and ORDERS that the Plaintiffs request to reverse the Commissioner's decision (Document 7) be DENIED and the Commissioner's request to affirm his decision (Document 8) be GRANTED." (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff challenged a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. The magistrate judge recommended affirming that decision and dismissing the action. The parties did not timely object to the proposed findings and recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was referred to Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The magistrate judge recommended denying the plaintiff's request to reverse, granting the Commissioner's request to affirm, affirming the Commissioner's final decision, and dismissing the case. Because neither party filed timely objections, the district court adopted the proposed findings and recommendation without further review.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985)
- Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983)

OPINION

Chafin

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

TIMMY C.,

Plaintiff, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-cv-00322

FRANK BISIGNANO,

Commissioner of Social Security, Defendant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

By Standing Order (Document 3) entered on May 19, 2025, this action was referred to the Honorable Dwane L. Tinsley, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (B). On February 20, 2026, the Magistrate Judge submitted a Proposed Findings and Recommendation (Document 10) wherein it is recommended that this Court deny the Plaintiff's request to reverse the Commissioner's decision (Document 7), grant the Commissioner's request to affirm his decision (Document 8), affirm the final decision of the Commissioner, and dismiss this action from the Court's docket. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Proposed Findings and Recommendation were due by March 6, 2026. Neither party has timely filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Proposed Findings and Recommendation. The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the 1 factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149- 50 (1985); see also Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983) (holding that district courts may adopt proposed findings and recommendations without explanation in the absence of objections). Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the Proposed Findings and Recommendation, and ORDERS that the Plaintiffs request to reverse the Commissioner's decision (Document 7) be DENIED and the Commissioner's request to affirm his decision (Document 8) be GRANTED. The Court further ORDERS that the final decision of the Commissioner be AFFIRMED and this action be DISMISSED from the Court's docket. The Court DIRECTS the Clerk to send a certified copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to Magistrate Judge Tinsley, counsel of record, and any unrepresented party. ENTER: March 10, 2026 Dire. Bengert

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-we/2026/timmy-c-v-frank-bisignano-commissioner-of-social-security-u2lvzas0>