

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

RANDY JAMES PEREZ,	)	Case No. CV 15-9279-PJW
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
v.	)	
	)	
CAROLYN W. COLVIN,	)	
ACTING COMMISSIONER OF THE	)	
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

---

I.

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff appeals a decision by Defendant Social Security Administration ("the Agency"), denying his claim for Supplemental Security Income ("SSI"). He claims that the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") erred when he: (1) rejected the treating doctor's opinion; (2) determined that Plaintiff and his mother were not credible; and (3) found that Plaintiff could work. For the reasons explained below, the ALJ's decision is reversed and the case is remanded to the Agency for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

1 II.

2 SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

3 In August 2011, Plaintiff applied for SSI, alleging that he had  
4 been unable to work since December 31, 2002, due to chronic lower back  
5 pain, Hepatitis C, hypertension, and insomnia. (Administrative Record  
6 ("AR") 226-34, 257.) The Agency denied the applications initially and  
7 on reconsideration. (AR 87, 97.) Plaintiff then requested and was  
8 granted a hearing before an ALJ. (AR 130-31.) On February 27, 2013,  
9 he appeared with counsel and testified at the hearing. (AR 48-50, 52-  
10 69.) On March 19, 2013, the ALJ issued a decision denying his  
11 application for benefits. (AR 98-112.)

12 Plaintiff appealed the ALJ's decision to the Appeals Council,  
13 which vacated the decision and remanded the case to the ALJ to further  
14 evaluate Plaintiff's mental impairment, reconsider the testimony of  
15 Plaintiff's mother, further evaluate the doctors' opinions after  
16 updating the record, develop the record regarding Plaintiff's past  
17 work, and, if warranted, obtain testimony from a vocational expert.  
18 (AR 114-16.)

19 On March 25, 2015, Plaintiff appeared with counsel at a second  
20 hearing before a different ALJ. (AR 31-42.) On June 26, 2015, the  
21 ALJ issued a decision denying Plaintiff's application for benefits.  
22 (AR 12-28.) Plaintiff appealed to the Appeals Council, which denied  
23 review. (AR 1-6.) This action followed.

24 III.

25 ANALYSIS

26 A. The Residual Functional Capacity Determination

27 The ALJ found that Plaintiff had the residual functional capacity  
28 to perform light work if it involved only occasional bending and

1 stooping. (AR 18.) Plaintiff objects to this finding. He contends  
2 that, in order to reach this conclusion, the ALJ improperly rejected  
3 the opinion of one of Plaintiff's treating doctors and discounted  
4 Plaintiff's and his mother's testimony without cause. (Joint Stip. at  
5 9-22, 37-43.) For the following reasons, the Court remands this issue  
6 to the Agency for further consideration.

7 1. The Treating Doctor's Opinion

8 In January 2013, Plaintiff's treating doctor, Dr. William  
9 Edelstein, diagnosed Plaintiff with chronic lower back pain and  
10 concluded that he could occasionally lift, carry, or pull less than  
11 ten pounds; stand or walk for a total of less than two hours in an  
12 eight-hour day; and sit continuously for less than six hours. (AR  
13 380.) He also opined that Plaintiff could not reach repeatedly and  
14 that he would miss 60 to 120 hours of work per month. (AR 380.)  
15 According to Dr. Edelstein, Plaintiff's condition had persisted for 13  
16 years. (AR 380.)

17 Had the ALJ accepted Dr. Edelstein's opinion, he would have had  
18 to conclude that Plaintiff was not even capable of performing full-  
19 time sedentary work. But the ALJ rejected Dr. Edelstein's opinion  
20 because: (1) it was not supported by objective medical evidence; and  
21 (2) it was undermined by the opinions of treating doctor John  
22 Landsberg, consultative examiner Ursula Taylor, and two reviewing  
23 doctors. (AR 21.) Ultimately, the ALJ concluded that Plaintiff could  
24 perform light work. Plaintiff argues that the ALJ erred in  
25 discounting Dr. Edelstein's opinion.

26 It is the province of the ALJ to resolve conflicts in the medical  
27 evidence. *Andrews v. Shalala*, 53 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 1995).  
28 There are three types of doctors that supply that evidence: treating

1 doctors, examining doctors, and reviewing doctors. All things being  
2 equal, treating doctors' opinions are entitled to the most weight  
3 because they are hired to cure and have more opportunity to know and  
4 observe the patient. *Id.* at 1041. Examining doctors are next on the  
5 list, followed by reviewing doctors. See *Lester v. Chater*, 81 F.3d  
6 821, 830-31 (9th Cir. 1995). ALJs, however, are not required to  
7 merely accept the opinion of any doctor and, where an opinion is  
8 contradicted, may reject it for specific and legitimate reasons that  
9 are supported by substantial evidence in the record. *Id.* at 830.

10 In rejecting Dr. Edelstein's opinion, the ALJ noted that, though  
11 a treating doctor's opinion is normally entitled to significant  
12 weight, that rule is only applicable if the opinion is supported by  
13 objective medical evidence. (AR 21.) He then went on to explain  
14 that, "such is not the case regarding the assessment of Dr. Edelstein  
15 of extreme physical limitations of 13 years duration (Exhibit 8F)."  
16 (AR 21.) In the ALJ's view, there was "no objective medical evidence  
17 to support such a restrictive residual functional capacity . . . ."  
18 (AR 21.)

19 Plaintiff complains that the ALJ's finding that Dr. Edelstein's  
20 opinion was not supported by the objective medical evidence was too  
21 general to be upheld on appeal. The Court agrees in part and  
22 disagrees in part. Clearly there is no objective medical evidence  
23 dating back to 2000 to support Dr. Edelstein's opinion that  
24 Plaintiff's condition persisted for 13 years. In fact, the medical  
25 records from the Santa Barbara County Health Department, where Dr.  
26 Edelstein worked and where he treated Plaintiff, only go back to 2010.  
27 (AR 337-41, 377-429.) Thus, the ALJ's finding that there was no  
28

1 objective medical evidence to support Dr. Edelstein's 2013 opinion  
2 that Plaintiff's condition had persisted for 13 years is affirmed.

3 The ALJ's companion finding that there was no objective medical  
4 evidence to support Dr. Edelstein's restrictive residual functional  
5 capacity finding is not. There is some objective evidence in the  
6 record that supports Dr. Edelstein's view, for example, his positive  
7 findings in straight leg testing, and some that undermines it. The  
8 ALJ was tasked with sorting through the evidence and explaining which  
9 evidence undermined Dr. Edelstein's opinion and which evidence  
10 supported it. His failure to do so amounts to error. See *Rodriguez*  
11 *v. Bowen*, 876 F.2d 759, 762 (9th Cir. 1989) ("Merely to state that a  
12 medical opinion is not supported by enough objective findings 'does  
13 not achieve the level of specificity our prior cases have required,  
14 even when the objective factors are listed seriatim.'") (quoting  
15 *Embrey v. Bowen*, 849 F.2d 418, 421 (9th Cir. 1988)).

16 The ALJ also questioned Dr. Edelstein's opinion because it was  
17 inconsistent with the opinions of treating doctor Landsberg (who took  
18 over Plaintiff's treatment in February 2013), examining doctor Ursula  
19 Taylor, and the reviewing doctors. Generally speaking, this is a  
20 valid reason for questioning a treating doctor's opinion. *Andrews*, 53  
21 F.3d at 1043 (upholding ALJ's rejection of treating doctor's opinion  
22 based in part on the fact that it was contradicted by opinions of  
23 nontreating doctors). And it is supported in part by the record. Of  
24 the five doctors involved in this case, only one, Dr. Edelstein,  
25 concluded that Plaintiff was so severely disabled that his physical  
26 limitations precluded him from performing even sedentary work. (AR  
27 380.) Three of the other four opined that Plaintiff could lift at  
28 least 20 pounds, walk for six hours in an eight-hour day, and sit for

1 at least six hours, which translates into being able to perform light  
2 work. (AR 83-84, 93, 360.) Dr. Landsberg did not offer an opinion on  
3 Plaintiff's residual functional capacity. He did, however, stop  
4 prescribing Plaintiff the narcotic Norco soon after he started  
5 treating Plaintiff, which could be interpreted as an indication of his  
6 view on the severity of Plaintiff's back pain.

7 The ALJ also explained that he relied on these other doctors  
8 based on the "length, nature and extent of the treating relationship,  
9 supportability with medical signs and laboratory findings, consistency  
10 with the record, and area of specialization." (AR 21.) The ALJ  
11 failed, however, to explain what he meant by this. For example, Dr.  
12 Edelstein clearly had the longest relationship with Plaintiff. He  
13 treated Plaintiff from September 2010 to February 2013. Dr. Taylor,  
14 the examining doctor, only saw him once and that was for an  
15 examination, not treatment. The reviewing doctors never saw him at  
16 all. Dr. Landsberg's treatment notes cover a period of about six  
17 months. Thus, to the extent that the ALJ discounted Dr. Edelstein's  
18 opinion based on the length and nature of the treatment, the ALJ erred  
19 here, too, because Dr. Edelstein treated Plaintiff for the longest  
20 and, therefore, that would have been a reason to rely on his opinion.

21 The ALJ also questioned Dr. Edelstein's opinion because the  
22 minimal objective medical evidence there was--an "MRI indicating  
23 minimal to mild degenerative changes to the lumbosacral spine"--did  
24 not support his view that Plaintiff was disabled. (AR 21.) The Court  
25 does not find this reason persuasive. None of the doctors opined that  
26 these findings establish that Plaintiff's back condition is not  
27 painful or debilitating. It appears that this conclusion was the  
28 ALJ's alone.

1           Though the Court considers this a close call, it concludes that  
2 remand is warranted for the ALJ to take another look at this issue.  
3 In doing so, he should explain what medical evidence undermines Dr.  
4 Edelstein's opinion and what the basis for that view is. For example,  
5 if the apparently unremarkable MRI findings establish that Plaintiff's  
6 back condition is not as severe as Plaintiff and Dr. Edelstein claim,  
7 then the ALJ should point to evidence in the record that substantiates  
8 that finding. The ALJ should also obtain Plaintiff's most recent  
9 medical records and consider them in determining whether Plaintiff is  
10 disabled.

11           2.    The ALJ's Credibility Determination

12           The ALJ found that Plaintiff was not credible. Plaintiff argues  
13 that the ALJ erred in doing so. For the following reasons, this  
14 finding is remanded for further consideration.

15           ALJs are tasked with judging a claimant's credibility. *Andrews*,  
16 53 F.3d at 1039. In doing so, they can rely on ordinary credibility  
17 techniques. *Smolen v. Chater*, 80 F.3d 1273, 1284 (9th Cir. 1996).  
18 Where there is no evidence of malingering, however, they can only  
19 reject a claimant's testimony for specific, clear, and convincing  
20 reasons that are supported by substantial evidence in the record.  
21 *Garrison v. Colvin*, 759 F.3d 995, 1014-15 (9th Cir. 2014).

22           Plaintiff suffers from sciatica and testified that he has back  
23 pain every day. (AR 35.) He claims that he can sit for only two  
24 hours at a time and can walk for only about five minutes before he has  
25 to rest. (AR 40.) He alleges that he uses a cane and a back brace  
26 when his back goes out once or twice a month, which causes pain that  
27 lasts up to two weeks. (AR 41.) According to Plaintiff, his back can  
28 go out when he is washing dishes or reaching to put a dish into the

1 cupboard. (AR 41.) As a result of his ailments and his insomnia, he  
2 only sleeps three to four hours a night. (AR 42.)

3 The ALJ found that Plaintiff's sciatica could reasonably be  
4 expected to cause his alleged symptoms but that his testimony that his  
5 symptoms were debilitating was not entirely credible because: (1) his  
6 ability to perform daily activities was inconsistent with his alleged  
7 limitations; (2) the objective medical evidence did not support his  
8 alleged degree of back pain; (3) he did not comply with treatment; and  
9 (4) his treatment was conservative. (AR 20, 21.) These are valid  
10 reasons for questioning a claimant's testimony. See *Orn v. Astrue*,  
11 495 F.3d 625, 639 (9th Cir. 2007) (holding ALJ can consider claimant's  
12 ability to perform daily activities in assessing credibility); *Rollins*  
13 *v. Massanari*, 261 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001) (noting ALJ can  
14 consider objective medical evidence in determining credibility of  
15 claimant); *Orn*, 495 F.3d at 638 (explaining ALJ may consider  
16 claimant's failure to follow prescribed course of treatment in  
17 evaluating testimony about severity of pain); *Meanel v. Apfel*, 172  
18 F.3d 1111, 1114 (9th Cir. 1999) (holding inconsistency between  
19 allegations of severe pain and conservative treatment was proper basis  
20 for discounting credibility). As explained below, however, not all of  
21 them are supported by substantial evidence in the record.

22 The ALJ questioned Plaintiff's claim that he could only walk for  
23 five minutes because his purported daily activities--including  
24 cleaning and vacuuming--"required more than [five] minutes of  
25 walking." (AR 20-21.) The Court does not agree with the ALJ's  
26 finding here. Plaintiff could have performed these chores in short  
27 intervals over the course of a day, particularly, where, as here, he  
28 was not working and was spending his days at home.



1           The government points out that Plaintiff told Dr. Edelstein that  
2 he was biking and walking seven days a week for exercise. (AR 389.)  
3 Clearly, this level of daily activity is inconsistent with Plaintiff's  
4 testimony that he suffered from debilitating pain that rendered him  
5 incapable of working. But the ALJ did not rely on this when analyzing  
6 Plaintiff's credibility and, as such, the Court is not at liberty to  
7 do so here. See *Pinto v. Massanari*, 249 F.3d 840, 847 (9th Cir. 2001)  
8 ("[W]e cannot affirm the decision of an agency on a ground that the  
9 agency did not invoke in making its decision.") (citation omitted).

10           The ALJ relied on the absence of objective medical evidence  
11 supporting Plaintiff's alleged pain to find that Plaintiff was not  
12 credible. The problem with this finding is that the ALJ failed to  
13 specify what evidence was missing and how the lack of it undermined  
14 Plaintiff's testimony. To the extent that he was referring to the  
15 benign findings in the MRI, the Court is not convinced, absent expert  
16 testimony, that that establishes that Plaintiff was not experiencing  
17 pain and limitation. The ALJ also failed to explain how the other  
18 objective evidence that was there, for example, the positive straight  
19 leg raising test results from Dr. Edelstein, did not support  
20 Plaintiff's testimony.

21           The ALJ also questioned Plaintiff's sincerity because he failed  
22 to follow medical advice. There is evidence in the record to support  
23 this finding. Dr. Landsberg noted that Plaintiff essentially refused  
24 to listen when he counseled him to start using different sleep  
25 medication. (AR 422, 426-27.) This could be construed as a sign that  
26 Plaintiff's pain and suffering was not as severe as he claimed. But  
27 Plaintiff's resistance here involved his insomnia medication, not his  
28 pain medication. And, though the insomnia and the pain from the

1 sciatica may have been related, the Court cannot conclude that  
2 Plaintiff's failure to take his insomnia medication proves that his  
3 statements about his back pain are exaggerated.

4 The ALJ pointed to the fact that Plaintiff received conservative  
5 treatment for what Plaintiff claimed was a debilitating back ailment.  
6 The Court sides with the ALJ here. The medical record in this case is  
7 sparse. It consists of a handful of treatment notes from Santa  
8 Barbara Health Care Center from 2010 to 2013 in which Plaintiff went  
9 to see Dr. Edelstein and complained about a bad back, insomnia, high  
10 blood pressure, and anxiety and Dr. Edelstein prescribed medications  
11 to treat his conditions. There are no records before 2010, despite  
12 the fact that Plaintiff claims that he has been disabled since 2002.  
13 There were no procedures performed on his back. He did not receive  
14 any injections. He did not receive any physical therapy. He simply  
15 reported to Dr. Edelstein on an infrequent basis and received  
16 medication. Though the medication Dr. Edelstein prescribed for  
17 Plaintiff's back pain was a narcotic, Norco, there is no indication in  
18 Dr. Edelstein's records that anything more was ever done to treat  
19 Plaintiff's condition. Further, soon after Dr. Landsberg took over  
20 Plaintiff's treatment, he stopped prescribing Norco.

21 Plaintiff purportedly used a back brace and a cane to treat his  
22 back pain. But there is no evidence to indicate that either were  
23 prescribed and, even assuming that they were, the Court would  
24 characterize them as conservative treatment, also.<sup>1</sup>

---

25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> It appears that Plaintiff was referred to a pain specialist by  
28 Dr. Landsberg (AR 418) but there are no records from the pain  
specialist.

1 In the end, some of the reasons cited by the ALJ are supported by  
2 the record and some are not. Because the Court is not convinced that  
3 the reasons that stand are enough to reject Plaintiff's testimony, the  
4 issue is remanded to the ALJ for further consideration. See *Carmickle*  
5 *v. Comm'r, Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 533 F.3d 1155, 1162-63 (9th Cir. 2008)  
6 (holding error is harmless only if substantial evidence remains to  
7 support the ALJ's credibility finding).<sup>2</sup>

8 3. Lay Witness Testimony

9 Plaintiff's mother submitted a written report, explaining what  
10 she perceived were Plaintiff's limitations. (AR 275-78.) The ALJ  
11 discussed her report but failed to explain whether he was accepting it  
12 or rejecting it. It seems fair to conclude, however, that the ALJ  
13 rejected parts of her "testimony" because his findings relating to  
14 what Plaintiff could do are inconsistent with what Plaintiff's mother  
15 reported that he could do. The Agency concedes that the ALJ failed to  
16 properly address the mother's testimony but argues that, because her  
17 testimony was so closely aligned with Plaintiff's, the ALJ's reasons  
18 for rejecting Plaintiff's testimony can and should be applied to the  
19 mother's.

20 The Court has remanded the issue of Plaintiff's credibility to  
21 the ALJ. Thus, the Agency's argument that the Court should uphold the  
22 ALJ's rejection of the mother's testimony for the same reasons it is  
23 upholding the rejection of Plaintiff's testimony necessarily fails.

---

24  
25 <sup>2</sup> The ALJ also seems to conclude that Plaintiff's mother's  
26 testimony undermined Plaintiff's testimony. (AR 21.) The Court does  
27 not see much difference between what Plaintiff reported and what his  
28 mother reported. (AR 263-70, 275-82.) In fact, their written  
reports, which were signed on the same day, closely mirror each other.  
(AR 263-70, 275-82.)

1 On remand, the ALJ should consider the mother's input as well and  
2 explain what weight, if any, he gives it and why. See *Nguyen v.*  
3 *Chater*, 100 F.3d 1462, 1467 (9th Cir. 1996) ("[L]ay witness testimony  
4 as to a claimant's symptoms . . . is competent evidence" which the  
5 Secretary must take into account.) (emphasis in original) (citations  
6 omitted).

7 B. Plaintiff's Past Relevant Work

8 Plaintiff contends that the ALJ erred in concluding that he could  
9 perform his past work as a medical file clerk because the job is  
10 defined as light work and Plaintiff is only capable of performing  
11 sedentary work. On remand, after addressing the issues outlined  
12 above, the ALJ will have to take another look at Plaintiff's residual  
13 functional capacity and then determine whether he can perform his past  
14 work.

15 C. The ALJ's Alternative Finding at Step Five

16 The ALJ also made an alternative finding that Plaintiff could  
17 perform other jobs existing in the national economy, such as cashier  
18 II and marker (retail). (AR 22-23.) Plaintiff argues that both of  
19 these jobs involve frequent reaching, handling, and fingering and,  
20 therefore, are beyond his ability to do sedentary work. (Joint Stip.  
21 at 51-52.)

22 The Court does not find Plaintiff's argument persuasive. The ALJ  
23 did not limit Plaintiff to frequent reaching, handling, and fingering,  
24 nor did he limit him to sedentary work. That being said, if the ALJ  
25 makes a different residual functional capacity determination on  
26 remand, he will have to to reconsider Step Four and, if warranted,  
27 Step Five, as well.

28

1 IV.

2 CONCLUSION

3 For the reasons set forth above, the Agency's decision is  
4 reversed and the action is remanded for further consideration  
5 consistent with this Memorandum Opinion and Order.<sup>3</sup>

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: February 8, 2017.

8 

9 

---

PATRICK J. WALSH  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 S:\PJW\Cases-Social Security\PEREZ, R 9279\Memo Opinion.wpd

16  
17 <sup>3</sup> Plaintiff has requested that the case be remanded for an award  
18 of benefits. (Joint Stip. at 53.) The Court recognizes that it has  
19 the authority to do so but finds that such relief is not warranted  
20 here. See *Dominguez v. Colvin*, 808 F.3d 403, 407 (9th Cir. 2015), as  
21 amended (Feb. 5, 2016) ("Unless the district court concludes that  
22 further administrative proceedings would serve no useful purpose, it  
23 may not remand with a direction to provide benefits."). Plaintiff  
24 purports to have suffered from a debilitating back condition for more  
25 than 13 years and yet submits only a handful of medical records, which  
26 consists of treatment notes from to 2010-2013. He alleged in a  
27 written report in September 2011 and in his testimony in February 2013  
28 that he is practically incapacitated, being barely capable of sitting  
for more than two hours and claimed to spend his days doing very  
little. (AR 263-70.) Yet, he told his doctor in October 2012 that he  
was exercising seven days a week, riding a bike and walking. (AR  
389.) In the end, the Court concludes that the medical records  
clearly do not support Plaintiff's claim that he has been disabled  
since 2002. The only issue for remand is whether the few records that  
are there from 2010 forward are enough to support a claim for  
disability for some period. Further administrative proceedings are  
necessary before that question can be answered.