

1 **WO**

2 NOT FOR PUBLICATION

3

4

5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9 Guadalupe C. Trevino,

No. CV-10-298-PHX-GMS

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER

11 vs.

12

13 Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of Social Security,

14 Defendant.

15

16

17 Pending before the Court is Defendant’s Unopposed Motion to Remand (Doc. 15)
18 pursuant to sentence four of Section 405(g) of the Social Security Act.¹ For good cause
19 showing,

20 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Defendant’s Unopposed Motion to Remand
21 (Doc. 15) is **GRANTED**.

22 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** directing the Clerk of the Court to remand this matter
23 to the Social Security Administration.


24 Upon remand, the Appeals Council shall instruct the administrative law judge to
25 redetermine the severity of Plaintiff’s impairments at step two of the five-step sequential

26

27 ¹ “Under sentence four” of § 405(g) of the Act, “a district court may remand in
28 conjunction with a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the [Commissioner’s] decision.” *Melkonyan v. Sullivan*, 501 U.S. 89, 99–100 (1991) (citing 42 U.S.C. § 405(g)).

1 evaluation process, proceed through the remaining steps of the sequential evaluation, and
2 properly evaluate all opinion evidence of record, providing specific reasons supported by the
3 record for the weight assigned to each opinion.

4 DATED this 21st day of July, 2010.

5 
6 _____
7 G. Murray Snow
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28