

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

MARY ANN MAGGIORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 3:15-cv-884(WIG)

CAROLYN COLVIN,
Acting Commissioner of
Social Security,

Defendant.

_____X

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR ENTRY
OF JUDGMENT WITH REVERSAL AND REMAND [DOC. # 24]

Defendant, Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, has moved this Court to enter judgment under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), with a reversal and remand of this cause to the Commissioner for further action. Counsel for Defendant represents that Plaintiff’s counsel, Ivan Katz, Esq., consents to the relief sought in the motion.

Under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), the Court has the power to enter a judgment with a reversal and remand of the cause to the Commissioner for further proceedings. *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 297 (1993); *Melkonyan v. Sullivan*, 501 U.S. 89, 98 (1991). Remand for further development of the record is appropriate when gaps exist in the administrative record or when the administrative law judge (“ALJ”) committed legal error. *Parker v. Harris*, 626 F.2d 225, 235 (2d Cir. 1980).

Here, the Commissioner has determined that further development of the record and additional administrative action is warranted. Upon remand, Plaintiff will be given an opportunity for a new hearing and to submit additional evidence in accordance with 20 C.F.R. §§ 405.331 and

405.350. Further, the ALJ will reassess Plaintiff's severe and non-severe impairments and make a new residual functional capacity finding, and in so doing reevaluate the medical and other opinions of record, including Plaintiff's subjective statements. The ALJ will also reevaluate Plaintiff's claims at steps four and five of the sequential process, obtaining vocational expert testimony if warranted. The ALJ will then issue a new decision.

Accordingly, Defendant's Motion for Entry of Judgment under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) with Reversal and Remand of the Cause to the Defendant [Doc. # 24] is granted.

This is not a Recommended Ruling. The parties have consented to the Magistrate Judge's entering a final order in this case without the need for entry of a recommended ruling and review by a District Judge. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 73(b). The Clerk is directed to enter a separate judgment in favor of Plaintiff in this matter under Rule 58(a), Fed. R. Civ. P., to remand this cause to the Commissioner for further administrative proceedings in accordance with this Order, and to close this case.

It is SO ORDERED, this 9th day of March, 2016, at Bridgeport, Connecticut.

/s/ William I. Garfinkel
WILLIAM I. GARFINKEL
United States Magistrate Judge