

1 BENJAMIN WAGNER CSBN 163581
 United States Attorney
 2 DONNA L. CALVERT SBN IL 619786
 Acting Regional Chief Counsel, Region IX
 3 Social Security Administration
 ELIZABETH BARRY CSBN 203314
 4 Special Assistant United States Attorney

5 160 Spear Street, Suite 800
 San Francisco, California 94105
 6 Telephone: (415) 977-8972
 Facsimile: (415) 744-0134
 7 Email: Elizabeth.Barry@ssa.gov

8 Attorneys for Defendant

9
 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SACRAMENTO DIVISION

11 CHERRHONDA LEE ANN CLARK,)
 12 Plaintiff,)
 13 v.)
 14 COMMISSIONER OF)
 15 SOCIAL SECURITY,)
 Michael Astrue)
 16 Defendant.)
 17)
 18 _____)

Case No. CIV-2:12-cv-00479-CMK

STIPULATION AND ORDER
 FOR REMAND PURSUANT TO SENTENCE
 FOUR OF 42 U.S.C. § 405(g)

19 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED, by and between the parties, through their respective counsel of
 20 record, that this action be remanded to the Commissioner of Social Security for further administrative
 21 action pursuant to section 205(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), sentence
 22 four.

23 On remand, the administrative law judge (ALJ) is directed to: (1) update the treatment evidence on
 24 the claimant's medical condition; (2) develop the record by forwarding the claimant's school records to
 25 Dr. Wakefield for consideration, or, alternatively, obtain a new psychological consultative examination;
 26 (3) if warranted, obtain evidence from a medical expert to clarify the nature and severity of the
 27 claimant's mental impairment and whether she meets or equals Listing 12.05C; (4) articulate how the
 28 severity of all medically determinable mental impairments was evaluated under the special technique; (5)
 explain how the credibility of the claimant's subjective complaints was evaluated in light of the

1 comments above; (6) expressly evaluate the treating, examining, and non-examining medical source
2 opinions in addition to the non-medical opinions cited above and explain the reasons for the weight he
3 gives to this opinion evidence; (7) further consider the claimant's residual functional capacity on the
4 updated record, citing specific evidence in support of the assessed limitations; (8) further consider
5 whether the claimant has past relevant work she could perform with the limitations established by the
6 evidence; (9) as appropriate, secure supplemental evidence from a vocational expert to clarify the effect
7 of the assessed limitations on the claimant's occupational base; and (10) consolidate and consider
8 together the claimant's subsequent application for concurrent benefits filed on June 20, 2011, denied at
9 the initial level.

11 Respectfully submitted,

12 Dated: December 26, 2012

/s/ Ann M. Cerney
(as authorized via telephone)
ANN M. CERNEY
Attorney for Plaintiff

15 BENJAMIN WAGNER
United States Attorney

16 Dated: December 26, 2012

17 By /s/ Elizabeth Barry
ELIZABETH BARRY
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney
Attorneys for Defendant

19
20
21 ORDER

22 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

23
24 DATED: January 7, 2013

25
26 
27 CRAIG M. KELLISON
28 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE