

**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

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION ISAAC K., Plaintiff, Case No. 25-10742 v. Honorable Shalina D. Kumar Magistrate Judge Kimberly G. Altman COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, Defendant. OPINION AND ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF NO. 16); DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF NO. 12); GRANTING COMMISSIONER’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF NO. 14); AND AFFIRMING THE COMMISSIONER’S DECISION Plaintiff Isaac K.¹ appeals the final decision of defendant Commissioner of Social Security (the “Commissioner”), challenging the denial of their application for supplemental security income (“SSI”) under the Social Security Act.

ECF No. 1. Pursuant to E.D. Mich. LR 72.1(b)(3), this matter was referred for all pretrial matters to the assigned magistrate judge. ECF No. 11. Both parties filed motions for summary judgment. ECF Nos. 12, 14. ¹ Consistent with guidance regarding privacy concerns in Social Security cases by the Judicial Conference Committee on Court Administration and Case Management, this district has adopted a policy to identify plaintiffs by only their first names and last initials.

See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(c)(2)(B). Page 1 of 3 On February 10, 2026, the magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”). ECF No. 16. The R&R recommends that plaintiff’s motion be denied; the Commissioner’s motion be granted; and the Commissioner’s decision be affirmed. *Id.* Neither party filed objections to the R&R and the time to do so has expired.

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). The failure to file a timely objection to an R&R constitutes a waiver of the right for further judicial review. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985) (“It does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusion, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”); *Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373–74 (6th Cir.

1987) (failure to file objection to R&R “waived subsequent review of the matter”); *Lardie v. Birkett*, 221 F. Supp. 2d 806, 807 (E.D. Mich. 2002) (“As to the part of the report and recommendation to which no party has objected, the Court need not conduct a review by any standard.”).

However, there is some authority that a district court is required to review the R&R for clear error. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 Advisory Committee Note Subdivision (b) (“When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the Page 2 of 3 record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

Therefore, the Court has reviewed the R&R for clear error and finds none. Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the R&R (ECF No. 16), DENIES plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 12), and GRANTS the Commissioner’s motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 14). 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.

IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Shalina D. Kumar SHALINA D. KUMAR Dated: March 10, 2026
United States District Judge Page 3 of 3