IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TRAVIS TERRY,   :   CIVIL ACTION
                              :   No. 14-6514
        Plaintiff,   :
                              :
     v.   :
                              :
CAROLYN W. COLVIN, ACTING   :
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, :
                              :
        Defendant.   :

O R D E R

AND NOW, this **3rd** day of **February, 2017**, after reviewing the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Henry S. Perkin (ECF No. 17), it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

(1) The Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;[1]

---

[1] The Court agrees with Judge Perkin that the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") appears to have not considered relevant and probative evidence in three of the six domains used to evaluate child disability, including acquiring and using information, attending and completing tasks, and interacting and relating to others. Further, it is troubling that the Commissioner did not respond at all to Plaintiff's allegations regarding specific mischaracterizations, omissions, and selective quotations made by the ALJ to reach her decision that Plaintiff was not disabled. For example, the Commissioner did not respond at all to Plaintiff's allegation that "the ALJ carelessly concluded that T.K.T. performed in the average range 'in all areas, except for Body Concepts/Awareness' on [five subtests of] the DTKR-II (Developmental Tasks for Kindergarten Readiness-II) test' because she failed to turn the page and

(3)   Plaintiff's request for review is **GRANTED**;

(4)   This matter is **REMANDED** to the Commissioner for further review consistent with this Order; and

(5)   The Clerk of Court shall mark this case as **CLOSED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Eduardo C. Robreno
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO,   J.

---

discover that there were an additional 13 subtest scores, including four on which Plaintiff's score was below average and 8 of which Plaintiff's score was significantly below average." Pl.'s Reply at 3, ECF No. 8. In light of this and numerous other undefended and significant errors, the Court agrees with Judge Perkin that the ALJ's decision was not supported by substantial evidence.