1			0
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	DEANNA CHAPMAN,)	CASE NO. CV 12-01250 RZ	
12	Plaintiff,	MEMORANDUM OPINION	
13	vs.	AND ORDER	
14	MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner) of Social Security,)		
15) Defendant.		
16	ý		

Plaintiff, legally blind in her right eye and with a cataract in her left eye,
 makes two challenges to the Commissioner's decision denying her application for disability
 benefits.

First, Plaintiff asserts that the Administrative Law Judge wrongly determined 20 that she could perform her past relevant work as a worker at a delicatessen, because that 21 work requires depth perception, which Plaintiff lacks, and the implicit view that the work 22 does not require depth perception is contrary to the description in the Dictionary of 23 Occupational Titles. Whatever the value of this argument, however, it is irrelevant because 24 the Administrative Law Judge made alternative findings that there was other work that 25 Plaintiff could perform. He found that she also could work as a cleaner or laundry worker 26 [AR 27], and Plaintiff does not challenge these alternative findings. 27

28

Second, Plaintiff asserts that the Administrative Law Judge gave "insufficient
reasons" to reject her testimony. Plaintiff argues that the Administrative Law Judge failed
to apply the standard of *Bunnell v. Sullivan*, 947 F.2d 341 (9th Cir. 1991) (*en banc*). That
case and its progeny hold that the Commissioner may not reject testimony about subjective
symptoms without giving specific and legitimate reasons for doing so.

But Plaintiff does not point to any *subjective* symptom testimony that the 6 Administrative Law Judge rejected improperly. In fact, Plaintiff does not point to any 7 particular testimony at all, simply referencing the entirety of the two hearing transcripts, 8 Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of Complaint at 17:20-21, and mixes the argument 9 (and law) about subjective symptoms with an argument about whether Plaintiff can work 10 a full-time job. The Administrative Law Judge focused on objective symptoms — what 11 was Plaintiff's eyesight — and found that Plaintiff was blind in the right eye, but had 12 correctable vision in the left. [AR22, 24-25] He even adjourned the first hearing so that 13 Plaintiff could have a consultative eye examination which would produce current 14 information as to Plaintiff's eyesight. [AR 80] He then fashioned a residual functional 15 capacity that took into account the results of the eye examination, including various 16 limitations to account for the right eye blindness and left eye cataract. This was not a 17 situation where a claimant testified about symptoms that were not measurable. 18

Substantial evidence supported the Administrative Law Judge in the findings
 he made as to Plaintiff's residual functional capacity and Plaintiff's ability to perform jobs
 in the national economy. Accordingly, the Commissioner's decision is affirmed.

26

- 27
- 28

DATED: January 14, 2013

UNITED STATES MAGIS TRATE JUDGE