

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Mary Pierre o/b/o John Clark, Jr. v. Social Security Administration

Pierre · No. 2:25-cv-02557 (Div. 2) · Decided March 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The court grants the Commissioner’s unopposed motion for judgment and remand in a Social Security disability benefits case. It reverses the Administrative Law Judge’s decision and remands the matter under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative proceedings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Donna Phillips Currault
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
DECIDED	March 23, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02557 (Div. 2)
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c) (3) of the Commissioner's denial of Supplemental Security Income and Disability Insurance Benefits. The Commissioner filed an unopposed motion for judgment and remand under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), the court reviews the Commissioner's decision on the pleadings and transcript of the record and may reverse and remand when the record is insufficient to support the Commissioner's conclusions and further fact-finding is necessary.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Mary Pierre o/b/o John Clark, Jr. v. Social Security Administration

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- remedies
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should grant the Commissioner's unopposed motion for judgment and remand under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
2. Whether the administrative decision should be reversed and remanded for further administrative proceedings because the record was insufficient to support the Commissioner's conclusions and further fact-finding was necessary.

HOLDINGS

1. A sentence-four remand is appropriate when the record is insufficient to support the Commissioner's conclusions and further fact-finding is necessary; such a remand requires the district court to enter a merits decision reversing, affirming, or modifying the Commissioner's decision before remanding.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Reversal of the Commissioner’s decision and remand for further proceedings is appropriate under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) when the record is insufficient to support the Commissioner’s conclusions and further fact-finding is necessary.” (II)

“A sentence four remand requires the district court to enter a decision on the merits before remanding a case to the Commissioner.” (II)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

John Clark, Jr. filed applications for SSI and DIB alleging disability beginning September 1, 2021. The Commissioner denied the applications initially and on reconsideration, and an ALJ later issued an unfavorable decision. The Appeals Council denied review, after which Plaintiff sought judicial review; the Commissioner conceded, through the unopposed remand motion, that further administrative proceedings were appropriate.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

John Clark, Jr. applied for SSI and DIB, and the applications were denied initially and on reconsideration. After an unfavorable decision by ALJ Jim Frasier and denial of review by the Appeals Council, Plaintiff filed this action. The Commissioner answered and filed the administrative record, then moved without opposition for reversal and sentence-four remand for a new administrative hearing and decision.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case is remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative proceedings, including a new administrative hearing and decision, pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

CASES CITED

- Melkonyan v. Sullivan, 501 U.S. 89, 98 (1991)
- Shalala v. Schaefer, 509 U.S. 292, 297-98 (1993)
- Sullivan v. Finkelstein, 496 U.S. 617, 625-26 (1990)

OPINION

Pierre

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

MARY PIERRE o/b/o JOHN * CIVIL ACTION

CLARK, JR.

* NO. 25-2557 DIV. (2)

VERSUS

* MAG. J. CURRAULT

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

*

ORDER AND REASONS

Plaintiff Mary Pierre filed this suit seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (the “Commissioner”) under 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) denying John Clark, Jr., Supplemental Social Security Income under Title XVI and Disability Insurance Benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act. ECF No. 1. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and the unanimous consent of the parties, the matter was referred to a magistrate judge for disposition. ECF No. 13. Pending before me is the Commissioner’s Unopposed Ex Parte/Consent Motion for Entry of Judgment and Remand. ECF No. 10. For the reasons below, the motion is granted, the Administrative Law Judge’s (ALJ) decision is reversed, and the matter is remanded for further administrative proceedings in accordance with sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). Judgment dismissing this case will be entered accordingly.

I. BACKGROUND

On March 29, 2022, John Clark, Jr., filed an application for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Title XVI of the Social Security Act and Disability Insurance Benefits (DIB) under Title II and Part A of Title XVIII of the Act, with disability beginning September 1, 2021. ECF No. 8, Admin. Rec. at 433-44. The Commissioner denied the claims for benefits on December 21, 2022. *Id.* at 86-87. Clark requested reconsideration of that decision, and on December 29, 2023, the hearing officer denied the applications on reconsideration. *Id.* at 116-17. Clark then requested a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge, which was conducted before ALJ Jim Frasier, who issued an unfavorable decision. *Id.* at 21-39. After the Appeals Council denied review on November 3, 2025, (*id.* at 1-4), Plaintiff filed this complaint seeking judicial review under 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and

1383(c)(3) of the Commissioner's final decision.¹ This Court issued a Briefing Schedule on March 3, 2026. ECF No. 11. However, after filing its Answer and Record of Proceedings, Defendant filed an Unopposed Motion for Judgment and Remand pursuant to the fourth sentence of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to allow the Commissioner to conduct a new administrative hearing and decision. ECF No. 10. The Commissioner's Motion denotes that the relief sought is unopposed.

II. APPLICABLE LAW AND ANALYSIS

Section 405(g) permits only two types of remand orders: "(1) remands pursuant to the fourth sentence, and (2) remands pursuant to the sixth sentence."² In this case, Defendant seeks remand under sentence four, which authorizes a court to enter a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commissioner, with or without remanding the cause for a rehearing, based on the pleadings and transcript of the record.³ Reversal of the Commissioner's decision and remand for further proceedings is appropriate under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) when the record is insufficient to support the 1 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g), 416(i), 423. 2 *Melkonyan v. Sullivan*, 501 U.S. 89, 98 (1991) (citation omitted). 3 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). Commissioner's conclusions and further fact-finding is necessary.⁴ A sentence four remand requires the district court to enter a decision on the merits before remanding a case to the Commissioner.' Thus, a request to remand for further administrative proceedings, like the remand requested in the Commissioner's motion, is a sentence four remand under section 405(g) and requires that the court enter a decision.^o The Commissioner's motion apparently, though not expressly, concedes that substantial evidence in the record is lacking at this time to uphold the decision when he asks that the court enter judgment and remand so that further proceedings may be conducted. ECF No. 10 at 2. Accordingly, 1t appears that good cause exists to support reversal of the decision and to remand this case.

II. CONCLUSION

Having reviewed the record, the submissions, and applicable law, for the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that Defendant's Unopposed Motion to Remand (ECF No. 10) be GRANTED, and judgment be entered REVERSING the Commissioner's decision and REMANDING the case for further administrative proceedings. . 23rd New Orleans, Louisiana, this day of March, 2026.

Mi PHILLIPS CURRAULT

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

4 See 42 U.S.C. § 405(g); *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 297-98 (1993) (stating that a district court remanding a

case pursuant to sentence four of Social Security Act must enter judgment either affirming, reversing or modifying the decision of the Commissioner); *Sullivan v. Finkelstein*, 496 U.S. 617, 625-26 (1990). 5 *Melkonyan*, 501 USS. at 98. See *Sullivan*, 496 U.S. at 625-26 (sentence four provides the appropriate relief when the evidence on the record does not support the Commissioner's conclusions and further fact finding is necessary).

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-louisiana-united-states-district-court-for/2026/mary-pierre-o-b-o-john-clark-jr-v-social-security-e8xi3fzj>