

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
ORLANDO DIVISION

ANTHONY BRADLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 6:24-cv-1279-JSS-LHP

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER**

On July 15, 2024, Plaintiff Anthony Bradley initiated this action against Defendant, the Commissioner of Social Security, seeking review of the Social Security Administration's decision to deny him disability benefits under the Social Security Act. (Dkt. 1 at 1.) The Commissioner of Social Security has since moved for this action to be reversed and remanded to the Commissioner under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative proceedings. (Motion, Dkt. 18.); *see* 42 U.S.C. §405(g) ("The court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript of the record, a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security, with or without remanding the cause for a rehearing."). Plaintiff does not oppose the motion. (*Id.* at 1–2.) On November 4, 2024, United States Magistrate Judge Leslie Hoffman Price entered a report and

recommendation recommending that the Motion be granted. (Dkt. 19.) No party has objected, and the time to do so has expired. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” *Id.*; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. With respect to non-dispositive matters, the district judge “must consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); *see Jordan v. Comm’r, Miss. Dep’t of Corr.*, 947 F.3d 1322, 1327 (11th Cir. 2020). For dispositive matters, the district judge must conduct a de novo review of any portion of the report and recommendation to which a timely objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *United States v. Farias-Gonzalez*, 556 F.3d 1181, 1184 n.1 (11th Cir. 2009) (“A district court makes a de novo determination of those portions of a magistrate’s report to which objections are filed.”). Even in the absence of a specific objection, the district judge reviews any legal conclusions de novo. *See Cooper-Houston v. S. Ry. Co.*, 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); *Ashworth v. Glades Cnty. Bd. of Cnty. Comm’rs*, 379 F. Supp. 3d 1244, 1246 (M.D. Fla. 2019).

Upon conducting a careful and complete review of the Magistrate Judge’s findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and giving de novo review to matters of law, the court adopts the report and recommendation in full.

Accordingly, it is ordered that:

1. Defendant's Unopposed Motion for Entry of Judgment with Remand (Dkt. 18) is **GRANTED**.
2. The final decision of the Commissioner is **REVERSED** and **REMANDED** for further proceedings pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
3. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant, terminate all other pending motions as moot, and to close this case.

**ORDERED** in Orlando, Florida, on November 20, 2024.



---

JULIE S. SNEED  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:  
Counsel of Record