

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION**

WILLIAM SANFORD DUNSON, III,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:17-cv-532-J-34MCR

vs.

ACTING COMMISSIONER OF THE  
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER**

**THIS CAUSE** is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Monte C. Richardson's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 16; Report), entered on April 17, 2018. In the Report, Magistrate Judge Richardson recommends that the decision of the Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration's (the Commissioner) be affirmed. See Report at 2, 15. Neither party has filed any objection to the Report, and the time for doing so has passed.

The Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If no specific objections to findings of facts are filed, the district court is not required to conduct a de novo review of those findings. See Garvey v. Vaughn, 993 F.2d 776, 779 (11th Cir. 1993); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, the district court must review legal conclusions de novo. See Cooper-Houston v. Southern Ry. Co., 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); United States v. Rice, No. 2:07-mc-8-FtM-29SPC, 2007 WL 1428615, at \*1 (M.D. Fla. May 14, 2007).

Upon independent review of the Magistrate Judge's Report, the Court will accept and adopt the legal and factual conclusions recommended by the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, it is hereby

**ORDERED:**

1. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 16) of Magistrate Judge Richardson is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.<sup>1</sup>
2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to enter judgment pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and 42 U.S.C. § 1383(c)(3) **AFFIRMING** the Commissioner's decision and close the file.

**DONE AND ORDERED** in Jacksonville, Florida, this 3rd day of July, 2018.

  
MARCIA MORALES HOWARD  
United States District Judge

i41

Copies to:

Counsel of Record

---

<sup>1</sup> In doing so, the Court construes the citation on page 14 to be Castle v. Colvin, 557 F. App'x 849, 853 (11th Cir. 2014) (noting that an ALJ does not "play doctor" when he determines RFC without the benefit of a medical opinion).