

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
NORTH CAROLINA

**April Springston v. Frank Bisignano, Acting Commissioner of Social
Security**

Springston · No. 1:24-cv-276-MOC-WCM · Decided June 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina reviewed a magistrate judge's Memorandum and Recommendation in a Social Security case where no objections were filed. The court affirmed the recommendation, vacated the Commissioner's decision, and remanded the matter for further administrative proceedings.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
ASHEVILLE DIVISION 1:24-cv-276-MOC-WCM APRIL SPRINGSTON,)) Plaintiff,)) Vs.)
ORDER) FRANK BISIGNANO,) Acting Commissioner of Social Security,)) Defendant.)
THIS MATTER is before the Court on review of a Memorandum and Recommendation issued in
this matter.

In the Memorandum and Recommendation, the magistrate judge advised the parties of the right to file objections within 14 days, all in accordance with 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(c). No objections have been filed within the time allowed.

I. Applicable Standard of Review The Federal Magistrates Act of 1979, as amended, provides that “a district court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir.1983).

However, “when objections to strictly legal issues are raised and no factual issues are challenged, de novo review of the record may be dispensed with.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Similarly, de novo review is not required by the statute “when a party makes general or conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations.” *Id.* Moreover, the statute does not on its face require any review at all of issues that are not the subject of an objection.

Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *Camby*, 718 F.2d at 200. Nonetheless, a district judge is responsible for the final determination and outcome of the case, and accordingly the Court has conducted a careful review of the magistrate judge's recommendation. II. Discussion After careful

review, the Court determines that the recommendation of the magistrate Judge is fully consistent with and supported by current law.

Further, the brief factual background and recitation of issues is supported by the applicable pleadings. Based on such determinations, the Court will fully affirm the Memorandum and Recommendation and grant relief in accordance therewith. ORDER IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Memorandum and Recommendation (Doc. No. 8) is AFFIRMED, the Commissioner's decision is vacated, and the matter is remanded for further administrative proceedings.

The Clerk is respectfully instructed to terminate Doc. Nos. 5 and 6, which are pending as motions.
Signed: June 1, 2026 i) ort-aaxna << Max O. Cogburn i yg United States District Judge Tie ga