

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
ARKANSAS, HOT SPRINGS DIVISION

Fred Edward Ross v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner, Social
Security Administration

Ross · No. 6:25-cv-06117-MEF · Decided April 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas reversed the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision denying benefits to Fred Edward Ross. The court remanded the case for further consideration under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and described the applicable deadlines for appeal and an application for attorney’s fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Hot Springs Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mark E. Ford
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Hot Springs Division
DECIDED	April 17, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-06117-MEF
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Judicial review of the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Substantial-evidence review of the Commissioner's decision.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Fred Edward Ross v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner, Social Security Administration

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

civil procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Commissioner's decision denying benefits was supported by substantial evidence.
2. Whether the case should be remanded under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

HOLDINGS

1. The Commissioner's decision denying benefits was not supported by substantial evidence.
2. The judgment must reverse the Commissioner's decision and remand the matter for further consideration pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the decision of the Commissioner denying benefits to the Plaintiff is not supported by substantial evidence and should be reversed and remanded for further consideration pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Commissioner of Social Security denied Ross's claim for benefits. The district court determined that the denial was not supported by substantial evidence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Commissioner denied Plaintiff's application for benefits. On judicial review, the district court concluded that the Commissioner's decision was not supported by substantial evidence and reversed and remanded under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Remand for further consideration pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

CASES CITED

- Shalala v. Schaefer, 509 U.S. 292, 296 (1993)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS HOT SPRINGS DIVISION FRED EDWARD ROSS PLAINTIFF v. CIVIL NO. 6:25-cv-06117-MEF FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner Social Security Administration DEFENDANT

JUDGMENT For reasons stated in a memorandum opinion dated April 17, 2026, we conclude that the decision of the Commissioner denying benefits to the Plaintiff is not supported by substantial evidence and should be reversed and remanded for further consideration pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

The parties have sixty days from entry of the judgment on the docket in which to appeal. If Plaintiff wishes to request an award of attorney's fees and cost under the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) 28 U.S.C. § 2412, an application may be filed up until 30 days after the judgment becomes "not appealable" i.e., 30 days after the 60-day time for appeal has ended.

See *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 296 (1993); 28 U.S.C. §§ 2412(d)(1)(B), (d)(2)(G). IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED this 17th day of April 2026. /s/ Mark E. Ford HON. MARK E. FORD UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE