

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN

Isaac K. v. Commissioner of Social Security

Isaac K. · No. 25-10742 · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan adopted the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation in an action challenging the denial of supplemental security income. The court denied the plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment, granted the Commissioner’s motion, and affirmed the Commissioner’s decision that the plaintiff was not disabled.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Shalina D. Kumar
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	25-10742
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income and moved for summary judgment. The magistrate judge recommended denial of plaintiff's motion, grant of the Commissioner's motion, and affirmance of the Commissioner's decision. The district court reviewed the unobjected-to Report and Recommendation for clear error, adopted it, denied plaintiff's motion, granted the Commissioner's motion, and affirmed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For an unobjected-to Report and Recommendation, the court reviewed the record for clear error and found none.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Isaac K. v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- 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 neither party filed timely objections.
2. Whether the Commissioner's decision denying plaintiff supplemental security income should be affirmed.

HOLDINGS

1. When neither party files a timely objection to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court need not conduct de novo review and may review the recommendation for clear error before accepting it.
2. The Commissioner's decision that plaintiff was not disabled under section 1614(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act is affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Judgment shall issue in favor of the Commissioner, AFFIRMING the Commissioner's decision that plaintiff is not disabled under section 1614(a)(3)(A) of the Act." (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Isaac K. applied for supplemental security income under the Social Security Act. The Commissioner denied the application, determining that plaintiff was not disabled under section 1614(a)(3)(A) of the Act. Plaintiff sought judicial review and challenged the denial, but the district court affirmed the Commissioner's decision after finding no clear error in the magistrate judge's recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an action challenging the final decision denying their application for supplemental security income. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Kimberly G. Altman for pretrial proceedings, and both parties moved for summary judgment. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation on February 10, 2026. Neither party filed objections, and the district court found no clear error, adopted the recommendation, and entered judgment for the Commissioner.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)
- Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373-74 (6th Cir. 1987)

- Lardie v. Birkett, 221 F. Supp. 2d 806, 807 (E.D. Mich. 2002)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-mic/2026/isaac-k-v-commissioner-of-social-security-wnqfpe3o>