

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).

OPINION

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