

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
FAYETTEVILLE DIVISION

MARIA C. CAMACHO

PLAINTIFF

v.

Civil No. 19-5126

ANDREW M. SAUL,¹ Commissioner
Social Security Administration

DEFENDANT

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, Maria C. Camacho, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of a decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (Commissioner) denying her application for a period of disability and disability insurance benefits (DIB) under Title II of the Social Security Act. (Doc. 1). The Defendant filed an Answer to Plaintiff's action on September 12, 2019, asserting that the findings of the Commissioner were supported by substantial evidence and were conclusive. (Doc. 11). On October 16, 2019, Plaintiff filed a motion for remand for consideration of new and material evidence. (Doc. 17).

On October 30, 2019, the Commissioner, having changed positions, filed an unopposed motion requesting that Plaintiff's case be remanded pursuant to "sentence four" of section 405(g) in order to conduct further administrative proceedings. (Doc. 19).

¹ Andrew M. Saul, has been appointed to serve as Commissioner of Social Security, and is substituted as Defendant, pursuant to Rule 25(d)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The exclusive methods by which a district court may remand a social security case to the Commissioner are set forth in "sentence four" and "sentence six" of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). A remand pursuant to "sentence six" is limited to two situations: where the Commissioner requests a remand before answering the complaint, or where the court orders the Commissioner to consider new, material evidence that was for good cause not presented before the agency. The fourth sentence of the statute provides that "[t]he 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." 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); Shalala v. Schaefer, 509 U.S. 292, 296, 113 S.Ct. 2625 (1993).

Here, the Court finds remand for the purpose of the ALJ to further evaluate the evidence appropriate.

Based on the foregoing, the Court finds remand appropriate and grants the Commissioner's unopposed motion to remand this case to the Commissioner for further administrative action pursuant to "sentence four" of section 405(g). Plaintiff's motion for remand for consideration of new and material evidence shall be denied as moot.

DATED this 5th day of November 2019.

/s/ Erin L. Wiedemann

HON. ERIN L. WIEDEMANN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE