

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA, ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

Anthony W. v. Frank J. Bisignano

Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-400 (RDA/LRV) · No. 1:25-cv-400 (RDA/LRV) · Decided March 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia adopts a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation in a Social Security disability case. The court grants the Commissioner’s motion for summary judgment, denies the plaintiff’s motion, and affirms the Commissioner’s final decision denying disability insurance benefits and Supplemental Security Income.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Alexandria Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Alexandria Division
DECIDED	March 18, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-400 (RDA/LRV)
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and § 1383(c)(3) of the Commissioner's final decision denying disability insurance benefits and Supplemental Security Income. The parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment, and a magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending affirmance.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review and must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record before accepting the recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited precedential value
PARTIES	Anthony W. v. Frank J. Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

Administrative Law

Civil Procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation when no party filed objections and the court found no clear error on the face of the record.
2. Whether the Commissioner's final decision denying Plaintiff disability insurance benefits and Supplemental Security Income should be affirmed.

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review and may accept the recommendation after satisfying itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record.
2. The Commissioner's final decision denying Plaintiff disability insurance benefits and Supplemental Security Income is affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation’”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Anthony W. sought disability insurance benefits and Supplemental Security Income under the Social Security Act. The Social Security Administration's Administrative Law Judge and Appeals Council determined that he was not disabled as defined by the Act and applicable regulations. The district court reviewed the Commissioner's final decision and the magistrate judge's recommendation after the parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Administrative Law Judge and Appeals Council determined that Plaintiff was not disabled under the Social Security Act and applicable regulations. Plaintiff filed this action for judicial review and moved for summary judgment; Defendant filed a cross-motion. Magistrate Judge Lindsey R. Vaala recommended denying Plaintiff's motion, granting Defendant's motion, and affirming the Commissioner's decision. No objections were filed, and the district court adopted the Report and Recommendation after finding no clear error.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division ANTHONY W.,) Plaintiffs, v. Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-400 (RDA/LRV)
FRANK J. BISIGNANO, Commissioner of Social Security,) Defendant.) ORDER This matter
comes before the Court on U.S. Magistrate Judge Lindsey R. Vaala's Report and Recommendation
("Report") (Dkt. 19) as well as the parties' cross motions for summary judgment (Dkts.

7, 12). Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and 42 U.S.C. § 1383 (c)(3), Anthony W. ("Plaintiff") seeks
judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of the U.S. Social Security
Administration ("Commissioner" or Defendant"), denying his claim for disability insurance
benefits and Supplemental Security Income under the Social Security Act.

The Commissioner's final decision is based on a finding by the Administrative Law Judge and
Appeals Council for the Office of Appellate Operations that Plaintiff was not disabled as defined
by the Social Security Act and applicable regulations. Judge Vaala recommends that the Court
deny Plaintiff's Motion, grant Defendant's Motion, and affirm the final decision of the
Commissioner.

Dkt. 19 at 2. The deadline for submitting objections to the Report was March 11, 2026. To date, no
objections have been filed. After reviewing the record and Judge Vaala's Report, and finding no
clear error,' the Court hereby APPROVES and ADOPTS the Report (Dkt. 19).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Defendant's Motion (Dkt. 12) is GRANTED, Plaintiff's
Motion (Dkt. 7) is DENIED, and the Commissioner's final decision is AFFIRMED; and it is
FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to enter Rule 58 judgment in favor
of Defendant and against Plaintiff; and it is FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is
DIRECTED to place this matter among the ended causes.

IT IS SO ORDERED. Alexandria, Virginia March (&, 2026 /s/ oo ' See *Diamond y. Colonial Life
& Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (in the absence of any objections to a
Magistrate Judge's Recommendation, the Court "need not conduct a de novo review, but instead
must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the
recommendation'").