

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
WEST VIRGINIA

Herbert Allen Goodson v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social
Security

Goodson · No. 2:25-cv-00513 · Decided March 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia adopted a magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations in a Social Security appeal. The court denied the plaintiff’s request for remand, granted the Commissioner’s request to affirm the agency decision, affirmed the Commissioner’s final decision, and dismissed the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia
DECIDED	March 18, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00513
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Following referral to a magistrate judge, the district court reviewed and adopted an unobjected-to proposed findings and recommendations in an action seeking review of the Commissioner's final Social Security decision.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review is required for portions of a magistrate judge's report or specified proposed findings and recommendations to which a timely objection is made; absent objection, the district court is not required to conduct de novo or any other review of those portions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security
- administrative law
- federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations when neither party timely objected.
2. Whether Plaintiff's request for remand should be denied and the Commissioner's final decision affirmed.

HOLDINGS

1. Because neither party timely objected to the PF&R, the district court was not required to conduct de novo or any other review of the magistrate judge's factual or legal conclusions and could adopt the PF&R.
2. The court denied Plaintiff's request for remand, granted Defendant's request to affirm, and affirmed the Commissioner's final decision.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Herbert Allen Goodson brought an action seeking remand of the Commissioner's final Social Security decision. Defendant Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security, requested affirmance of that decision. The magistrate judge recommended denial of remand and affirmance, and neither party filed timely objections.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Omar J. Aboulhosn under 28 U.S.C. § 636. The magistrate judge issued proposed findings and recommendations recommending denial of Plaintiff's request for remand, grant of Defendant's request to affirm, affirmance of the Commissioner's final decision, and dismissal. Neither party timely objected, so the district court adopted the PF&R and entered judgment consistent with it.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985)

OPINION

Goodson

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

CHARLESTON DIVISION

HERBERT ALLEN GOODSON,

Plaintiff, v. CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:25-cv-00513

FRANK BISIGNANO

Commissioner of Social Security, Defendant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Omar J. Aboulhosn for submission of proposed findings of fact and recommendations for disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On February 27, 2026, Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn submitted his Proposed Findings & Recommendations (“PF&R”), [ECF No. 18], and recommended that the court DENY the Plaintiff’s request for remand, [ECF No. 15], GRANT the Defendant’s request to affirm the final decision, [ECF No. 16], AFFIRM the final decision of the Commissioner, and DISMISS this matter from the court’s docket. Neither party timely filed objections to the PF&R nor sought an extension of time. A district court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). This court is not, however, required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Because the parties have not filed objections in this case, the court adopts and incorporates herein the PF&R and orders judgment consistent therewith. The court DENIES the Plaintiff’s request for remand, [ECF No. 15], GRANTS the Defendant’s request to affirm the final decision, [ECF No. 16], AFFIRMS the final decision of the Commissioner, and DISMISSES this matter from the court’s docket. The court DIRECTS the Clerk to send a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party. ENTER: March 18, 2026

ee STATES DISTRICT JUDGE