

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

Dwayne Jerald Bond v. Commissioner of Social Security

Bond · No. 1:25CV410 · Decided January 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio adopted the Magistrate Judge’s report and recommendation because no objections were filed within the time permitted by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). The court affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision in the plaintiff’s case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John R. Adams
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	January 28, 2026
DOCKET	1:25CV410
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's decision. The matter was referred to a magistrate judge, who recommended affirmance. After no timely objections were filed, the district court adopted the report and recommendation and affirmed the Commissioner's decision.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the magistrate judge's report and recommendation under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and, because no objections were filed, adopted it without further review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Dwayne Jerald Bond v. 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 adopt the magistrate judge's report and recommendation when no timely objections were filed.
2. Whether the Commissioner's decision should be affirmed as recommended by the magistrate judge.

HOLDINGS

1. When no timely objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court adopted the report and recommendation without conducting further review.
2. The Commissioner's decision was affirmed because the district court adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending affirmance.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Any further review by this Court would be a duplicative and inefficient use of the Court's limited resources."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion provides no substantive facts concerning Bond's claim for Social Security benefits. The decision addresses only the procedural disposition of the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and the absence of timely objections.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 5, 2026, the magistrate judge submitted a report and recommendation recommending that the Commissioner's decision be affirmed. Neither party filed objections within the fourteen-day period provided by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). The district court adopted the report and recommendation and affirmed the Commissioner.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984)
- Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991)
- United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981)