

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

Rashawna R. Jones v. Commissioner of Social Security
Administration

Jones · No. 1:25-cv-00515 · Decided March 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio adopts the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation in an action challenging the denial of Supplemental Security Income and disability benefits. Because no objections were filed and the court found no clear error, it affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s final decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Donald C. Nugent
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 4, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00515
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought review of the Commissioner's final decision denying her applications for Supplemental Security Income and disability insurance benefits. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who recommended affirmance; no party objected, and the district court adopted the recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no timely objection is filed to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. Properly objected-to portions are reviewed de novo under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation or stated precedential designation.
PARTIES	Rashawna R. Jones v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability benefits

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What standard of review applies to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no party files a timely objection?
2. Whether the Commissioner's final decision denying Jones's applications for Supplemental Security Income and disability insurance benefits should be affirmed.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objection is filed, the district court need only determine whether there is clear error on the face of the record before accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation.
2. The Commissioner's final decision denying Jones's applications for Supplemental Security Income and disability benefits is affirmed.

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.”

“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to these findings.” (150)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rashawna R. Jones applied for Supplemental Security Income and disability insurance benefits. The Commissioner denied the applications, and Jones challenged that final decision in the district court. The magistrate judge recommended affirmance, and no party objected.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge James E. Grimes issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the Commissioner's final decision be affirmed. Because neither party filed an objection, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error on the face of the record, found none, adopted the recommendation, and affirmed the Commissioner's decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)

OPINION

Jones

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

EASTERN DIVISION

RASHAWNA R. JONES,) CASE NO. 1: 25 CV 515

) Plaintiff,) JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT)

v.) ORDER ADOPTING REPORT

) AND RECOMMENDATION

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL)

SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,)

)) Defendant.) This matter comes before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge James E. Grimes. (ECF #11) Plaintiff challenges the final decision the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying her application for Supplemental Security Income and disability insurance benefits. Magistrate Judge Grimes recommends that the Commissioner’s final decision be affirmed. (ECF #11) No objection to the Report and Recommendation has been filed. Standard of Review for a Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation The applicable standard of review of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation depends upon whether objections were made to that report. When objections are made to a report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court reviews the case de novo. FED R. Civ. P. 72(b) states: The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. The text of Rule 72(b)(3) addresses only the review of portions of reports to which timely objections have been made; it does not indicate the appropriate standard of review for portions of the report to which no objections have properly been made. The Advisory Committee on Civil Rules commented on the standard of review stating, “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.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s notes (citations omitted). The U.S. Supreme Court stated: “It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of magistrate judge’s factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to these findings.” Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150

(1985). Here, no objection was filed by either party. Accordingly, this Court reviews the Report

and Recommendation for a finding of clear error on the face of the record. Conclusion The Court has carefully reviewed the Report and Recommendation and agrees with the findings set forth therein. As there is no clear error on the face of the record, the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Grimes (ECF #11) is ADOPTED. The final decision of the Commissioner denying Plaintiff's application for Supplemental Security Income and disability benefits is affirmed. IT IS SO ORDERED. United States District Judge aren. nda 4h,