

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Harriss v. Commissioner of Social Security

Harriss · No. 1:22-cv-1068 JLT CDB · Decided July 15, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a Social Security disability benefits action. The court granted Jerry Harriss’s motion for summary judgment, reversed the Commissioner’s decision, and remanded the matter for further proceedings under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 15, 2025
DOCKET	1:22-cv-1068 JLT CDB
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying disability insurance benefits. The magistrate judge recommended granting Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, reversing the administrative decision, and remanding for further proceedings. The district court conducted de novo review, adopted the findings and recommendations, granted summary judgment for Plaintiff, and remanded under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviewed the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In reviewing the administrative decision, the court applied the requirement that an ALJ provide clear and convincing reasons supported by substantial evidence when rejecting a claimant's subjective symptom testimony, and determined that the ALJ's error was not harmless.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is unknown in the source metadata.
PARTIES	Jerry Harriss v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

summary judgment

administrative law

civil procedure

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the administrative law judge provided legally sufficient reasons, supported by substantial evidence, for rejecting Plaintiff's subjective symptom testimony.
2. Whether the ALJ's error was harmless.
3. Whether the administrative decision should be reversed and remanded under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ failed to provide clear and convincing reasons supported by substantial evidence for rejecting Plaintiff's subjective symptomology testimony.
2. The ALJ's error was not harmless, requiring reversal of the administrative decision and remand for further proceedings.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The administrative decision is REVERSED." (at 1-2)

"This matter is REMANDED pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. §405(g) for further proceedings." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jerry Harriss applied for a period of disability and disability insurance benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act. The Commissioner denied the application through an administrative decision, and Harriss sought judicial review. He contended that the administrative law judge failed to properly evaluate his subjective complaints.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jerry Harriss challenged an administrative law judge's denial of his application for disability insurance benefits, arguing that the ALJ improperly evaluated his subjective complaints. The magistrate judge found that the ALJ failed to provide clear and convincing reasons supported by substantial evidence for rejecting Harriss's testimony and that the error was not harmless. Neither party objected to the findings and recommendations, and the district court adopted them in full after de novo review.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The action is remanded pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff Jerry Harriss and against the Commissioner of Social Security.

CASES CITED

- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)

OPINION

(SS) Harriss v. Commissioner of Social Security

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 JERRY HARRISS, Case No. 1:22-cv-1068 JLT CDB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING
FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS, GRANTING

13 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY

JUDGMENT AND REMANDING ACTION

14 v. PURSUANT TO SENTENCE FOUR OF 42

U.S.C. §405(g)

15 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

ORDER DIRECTING ENTRY OF

16 Defendant. JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFF

JERRY HARRISS AND AGAINST

17 DEFENDANT COMMISSIONER OF

SOCIAL SECURITY

18 (Docs. 12, 15, and 17) 19 20 Jerry Harriss seeks judicial review of a final decision of the
Commissioner of Social 21 Security denying his application for a period of disability and
disability insurance benefits under 22 Title II of the Social Security Act. (Docs. 1, 12.) Plaintiff
asserted the administrative law judge 23 failed to properly evaluate Plaintiff's subjective
complaints. (Doc. 12.) The Commissioner 24 argued the ALJ identified legally sufficient reasons
for rejecting Plaintiff's statements, and 25 requested the Court affirm the administrative decision.
(Doc. 15.) 26 The magistrate judge found that the ALJ failed to provide clear and convincing
reasons 27 supported by substantial evidence in rejecting Plaintiff's subjective symptomology
testimony. (Doc. 17 at 18-25.) In addition, the magistrate judge determined the ALJ's error was not
1 | harmless. (Ud. at 25.) Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended that the Court grant 2 |
Plaintiff's appeal, reverse the decision of the ALJ, remand this matter for further proceedings, and
3 | enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff. (/d.) 4 The Court served the Findings and

Recommendations on the parties and notified them that 5 | any objections were due within 14 days. (Doc. 17 at 26.) The Court advised the parties that 6 | “failure to file any objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of certain rights 7 | on appeal.” (/d., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)). Neither party 8 | filed objections, and the time to do so has passed. 9 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court performed a de novo review of this case. 10 | Having carefully reviewed the entire matter, the Court concludes the Findings and 11 || Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS: 12 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on June 26, 2025 (Doc. 17) are 13 ADOPTED in full. 14 2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 12) is GRANTED. 15 3. The Commissioner’s request to affirm (Doc. 15) is DENIED. 16 4. The administrative decision is REVERSED. 17 5. This matter is REMANDED pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. §405(g) for 18 further proceedings. 19 6. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff Jerry Harriss 20 and against Defendant Commissioner of Social Security. 21 92 | IT IS SO ORDERED. 23 | Dated: _ July 14, 2025 Charis [Tourn
TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25 26 27 28