

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

CARRIE PETROSKI,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil No. 17-cv-983-JPG-CJP
	)	
COMMISSIONER of SOCIAL SECURITY,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Before the Court is the parties’ Agreed Motion for Remand to the Commissioner. (Doc. 22.)

The parties ask that this case be remanded for further proceedings pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). A sentence four remand (as opposed to a sentence six remand) depends upon a finding of error, and is itself a final, appealable order. *See Melkonyan v. Sullivan*, 501 U.S. 89 (1991); *Perlman v. Swiss Bank Corporation Comprehensive Disability Protection Plan*, 195 F.3d 975, 978 (7th Cir. 1999). Upon a sentence four remand, judgment should be entered in favor of plaintiff. *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 302-303 (1993).

The parties agree that, upon remand, “the ALJ will receive additional evidence, and, in accordance with agency regulations and rulings, the ALJ will review the medical evidence, reweigh the medical opinions in the record, and reassess Plaintiff’s residual functional capacity. After reevaluating the evidence, the ALJ will issue a new decision regarding the disability application.”

Plaintiff applied for disability benefits in October 2013. (Tr. 10.) While recognizing that the agency has a full docket, the Court urges the Commissioner to expedite this case on remand.

For good cause shown, the parties’ Agreed Motion for Remand (Doc. 22) is **GRANTED**.

The final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Carrie Petroski's application for social security benefits is **REVERSED and REMANDED** to the Commissioner for rehearing and reconsideration of the evidence, pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in favor of plaintiff.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: APRIL 10, 2018**

**s/ J. Phil Gilbert**  
**J. PHIL GILBERT**  
**DISTRICT JUDGE**