

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ERIN KATHLEEN O’DONNELL,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CAROLYN W. COLVIN, ACTING  
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,<sup>1/</sup>  
Defendant.

) Case No. ED CV 12-1261 JCG

) **MEMORANDUM OPINION AND  
ORDER**

---

Erin Kathleen O’Donnell (“Plaintiff”) challenges the Social Security Commissioner’s (“Defendant”) decision denying her application for disability benefits. Specifically, Plaintiff asserts that the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) improperly assessed her Residual Functional Capacity (“RFC”). (Joint Stip. at 4.) This determination, so Plaintiff contends, was not adequately supported by the record. (*Id.*) The Court agrees, albeit on narrower grounds.<sup>2/</sup>

---

<sup>1/</sup> Carolyn W. Colvin is substituted as the proper defendant herein. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d).

<sup>2/</sup> As part of her discussion, Plaintiff alludes to numerous, distinct theories of error, including the improper assessment of medical evidence and the failure to call a

1 In assessing a claimant’s RFC, the ALJ “must include a narrative discussion  
2 describing how the evidence supports each conclusion, citing specific medical facts  
3 (e.g., laboratory findings) and nonmedical evidence (e.g., daily activities,  
4 observations).” Social Security Ruling (“SSR”) 96-8P, 1996 WL 374184, at \*7.  
5 The ALJ’s discussion must also “explain how any material inconsistencies or  
6 ambiguities in the evidence . . . were considered and resolved.” *Id.*

7 Here, the ALJ found Plaintiff able to perform “the full range of light work.”  
8 (AR at 24.) To support this RFC determination, the ALJ needed to address  
9 Plaintiff’s abilities to lift and carry weight. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 404.1567(b) (light work  
10 requires the ability to lift and carry 20 pounds occasionally and 10 pounds  
11 frequently). The ALJ’s decision contains no such discussion and thus falls below  
12 the standards mandated by SSR 96-8P.

13 This is so despite the ALJ’s extensive treatment of the record, which  
14 Defendant reviews at length. (*See* Joint Stip. at 11-12.) True, the ALJ did cite  
15 evidence painting a benign picture of Plaintiff’s impairments, but such *general*  
16 evidence does not speak to the *specific* issue of Plaintiff’s ability to lift and carry  
17 weight.<sup>3/</sup>

18 Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, the ALJ erred in assessing  
19 Plaintiff’s RFC. The Court thus determines that the ALJ’s decision is not supported

20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 medical advisor. (*See* Joint Stip. at 4-7, 12-13.) For present purposes, these issues  
22 need not be resolved.

23 <sup>3/</sup> Without belaboring the record, the Court highlights a few of the ALJ’s  
24 observations here. Regarding the medical evidence, the ALJ found it generally  
25 unremarkable. (*See* AR at 22.) One record, for instance, revealed a “satisfactory  
26 range of motion of all joints and extremities, no reported muscle spasm[s], no low  
27 back tenderness, no arthritic stigmata, and no neurological deficits.” (*Id.*) Similarly,  
28 a radiographic study showed only “mild degenerative changes” in Plaintiff’s cervical  
spine. (*Id.*) As for Plaintiff’s treatment history, it apparently consisted only of  
regular exercise and a prescription for Nortriptyline. (*Id.*)

1 by substantial evidence. *Mayes v. Massanari*, 276 F.3d 453, 458-59 (9th Cir. 2001).

2 With error established, this Court has discretion to remand or reverse and  
3 award benefits. *McAllister v. Sullivan*, 888 F.2d 599, 603 (9th Cir. 1989). Where no  
4 useful purpose would be served by further proceedings, or where the record has been  
5 fully developed, it is appropriate to exercise this discretion to direct an immediate  
6 award of benefits. *See Benecke v. Barnhart*, 379 F.3d 587, 595-96 (9th Cir. 2004).

7 But where there are outstanding issues that must be resolved before a determination  
8 can be made, or it is not clear from the record that the ALJ would be required to find  
9 plaintiff disabled if all the evidence were properly evaluated, remand is appropriate.  
10 *See id.* at 594.

11 On remand, the ALJ shall obtain, if necessary, additional information and  
12 clarification regarding Plaintiff's impairments. On the basis of this information, the  
13 ALJ shall then redetermine Plaintiff's RFC with sufficient detail as required by SSR  
14 96-8P.

15 Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED THAT judgment shall be entered  
16 **REVERSING** the decision of the Commissioner denying benefits and  
17 **REMANDING** the matter for further administrative action consistent with this  
18 decision.<sup>4/</sup>

19  
20 Dated: May 23, 2013

21  
22   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Jay C. Gandhi

23 United States Magistrate Judge  
24  
25  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>4/</sup> In light of the Court's remand instructions, it is unnecessary to address  
Plaintiff's remaining contention. (*See Joint Stip.* at 13-16, 19-20.)