

FILED IN THE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

**Dec 30, 2019**

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

TABITHA ANN H.,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant.

No. 2:18-CV-00397-RHW

**ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Before the Court are the parties’ cross-motions for summary judgment. ECF Nos. 12, 13. Plaintiff brings this action seeking judicial review pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner of Social Security’s final decision, which denied her application for Disability Insurance Benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 401-434, and her application for Supplemental Security Income under Title XVI of the Act, 42 U.S.C. §1381-1383F. *See* Administrative Record (AR) at 537-541, 545-564. After reviewing the administrative record and briefs filed by the parties, the Court is now fully informed. For the reasons set forth

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT ~ 1**

1 below, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment and  
2 **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment.

3 **I. Jurisdiction and Procedural History**

4 Plaintiff filed applications for Disability Insurance Benefits and  
5 Supplemental Security Income on June 23, 2011. AR 84-85, 204-217. In both  
6 applications, she alleged disability beginning on November 25, 2009.<sup>1</sup> AR 204,  
7 211. Plaintiff’s application was initially denied on July 29, 2011, AR 126-129, and  
8 on reconsideration on October 31, 2011. AR 132-135.

9 A hearing with Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) R.J. Payne occurred on  
10 March 13, 2013. AR 41-53. At the hearing, the psychological expert opined that  
11 there was not enough information to determine psychological impairments and  
12 requested a consultative psychological evaluation. AR 51-53. Following the  
13 evaluation, the ALJ held a supplemental hearing on August 20, 2013. AR 54-83.  
14 On September 16, 2013, the ALJ issued a decision concluding that Plaintiff was  
15 not disabled as defined in the Act and was therefore ineligible for disability  
16 benefits or supplemental security income. AR 18-36. The Appeals Council denied  
17 Plaintiff’s request for review on March 21, 2015, AR 1-6, and Plaintiff filed a  
18 complaint in this district challenging the denial of benefits. AR 654-655; *see*

19  
20  

---

<sup>1</sup> However, for claims under Title XVI, the month after the application’s filing date is the earliest that SSI benefits are payable. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 416.335.

1 *Tabitha Ann H. v. Carolyn W. Colvin*, 2:15-cv-00132-RHW, ECF No. 3 (E.D.  
2 Wash. 2015).

3 Plaintiff moved for summary judgment, arguing the ALJ erred by: (1)  
4 improperly discrediting her subjective symptom complaints; (2) failing to properly  
5 consider and weigh the medical opinion evidence, specifically the opinions of  
6 treating physician Duncan Lahtinen, D.O., examining psychologist John Arnold,  
7 Ph.D., and examining psychologist John Severinghaus, Ph.D.; (3) failing to obtain  
8 the testimony of a vocational expert to make the step five determination; and (4)  
9 not giving controlling weight to Dr. Lahtinen's medical opinion. *See Tabitha Ann*  
10 *H.*, 2:15-cv-00132-RHW, ECF No. 12, at 10-17.

11 In July 2016, the Court issued a decision rejecting most of Plaintiff's  
12 contentions but agreeing with one. AR 664-673. The Court concluded that the ALJ  
13 erred in assigning little weight to Dr. Severinghaus's opinion. AR 672-73.  
14 Accordingly, the Court remanded this case to the Commissioner with instructions  
15 to credit the opinion of Dr. Severinghaus. AR 674. Upon crediting Dr.  
16 Severinghaus's opinion, the Court instructed the ALJ to recalculate the residual  
17 functional capacity and then evaluate Plaintiff's ability to perform past relevant  
18 work as well as work available in the national economy. AR 674.

19 Following the Court's remand, the ALJ held another hearing on March 2,  
20 2017. AR 571-619. On June 16, 2018, the ALJ issued another decision in which he

1 again concluded that Plaintiff was not disabled as defined in the Act and was  
2 therefore ineligible for benefits. AR 545-564. On July 10, 2017, Plaintiff submitted  
3 written exceptions to the ALJ's decision. AR 751-755. On November 3, 2018, the  
4 Appeals Council determined that Plaintiff's exceptions were meritless and declined  
5 to assume jurisdiction. AR 537-541. On December 31, 2018, Plaintiff timely filed  
6 the present action challenging the denial of benefits. ECF No. 1. Accordingly,  
7 Plaintiff's claims are properly before the Court pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

### 8 **III. Standard of Review**

9 A district court's review of a final decision of the Commissioner is governed  
10 by 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The scope of review under § 405(g) is limited, and the  
11 Commissioner's decision will be disturbed "only if it is not supported by  
12 substantial evidence or is based on legal error." *Hill v. Astrue*, 698 F.3d 1144,  
13 1158-59 (9th Cir. 2012) (citing § 405(g)). In reviewing a denial of benefits, a  
14 district court may not substitute its judgment for that of the ALJ. *Matney v.*  
15 *Sullivan*, 981 F.2d 1016, 1019 (9th Cir. 1992). When the ALJ presents a reasonable  
16 interpretation that is supported by the evidence, it is not the role of the courts to  
17 second-guess it. *Rollins v. Massanari*, 261 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001). Even if  
18 the evidence in the record is susceptible to more than one rational interpretation, if  
19 inferences reasonably drawn from the record support the ALJ's decision, then the

1 court must uphold that decision. *Molina v. Astrue*, 674 F.3d 1104, 1111 (9th Cir.  
2 2012); *see also Thomas v. Barnhart*, 278 F.3d 947, 954 (9th Cir. 2002).

3 **IV. Statement of Facts**

4 The facts of the case are set forth in detail in the transcript of proceedings  
5 and only briefly summarized here. Plaintiff was 41 years old on the alleged date of  
6 onset, which the regulations define as a younger person. AR 86; *see* 20 C.F.R. §  
7 404.1563(c). She attended school through the ninth grade, obtained her GED, and  
8 can communicate in English. AR 64, 230-31. Plaintiff has past work as a motel  
9 housekeeper and janitor. AR 35, 245-49, 783.

10 **VI. Issues for Review<sup>2</sup>**

11 Plaintiff argues that the Commissioner's decision is not free of legal error  
12 and not supported by substantial evidence. ECF No. 12 at 18. Specifically, she  
13 argues the ALJ: (1) failed to credit Dr. Severinghaus's opinion as required by the  
14 Court's prior remand order, and (2) improperly evaluated and weighed the medical  
15 opinion evidence. *Id.*

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

---

19 <sup>2</sup> The Court would ordinarily outline the Commissioner's five-step sequential evaluation  
20 process as well as the ALJ's findings with respect to each step. However, because Plaintiff raises  
issues that are not substantively related to the sequential evaluation process, this recitation is  
unnecessary in this case.

1 **VII. Discussion**

2 **A. The ALJ Credited Dr. Severinghaus’s Opinion as Required by**  
3 **this Court’s Remand Order**

4 Plaintiff argues that the ALJ did not credit Dr. Severinghaus’s opinion. ECF  
5 No. 12 at 15. Specifically, Plaintiff contends that the psychological medical expert  
6 who testified at the most recent hearing, Nancy Winfrey, Ph.D., was not aware  
7 that: (1) Dr. Severinghaus diagnosed Plaintiff with posttraumatic stress disorder,  
8 and (2) treating physician Dr. Lahtinen documented Plaintiff’s depression and also  
9 agreed with Dr. Arnold’s findings. *Id.* at 15-16.

10 However, the ALJ credited Dr. Severinghaus’s opinion. *See* AR 562 (“Per  
11 the remand order, “credit” is being given to the opinions and findings of Dr.  
12 Severinghaus.”). Plaintiff does not identify any portion of the ALJ’s updated  
13 residual functional capacity finding that conflicts with Dr. Severinghaus’s opinion.  
14 *See* ECF No. 12 at 15-16

15 In order to fully incorporate Dr. Severinghaus’s report into the residual  
16 functional capacity pursuant to the remand order, the ALJ asked Dr. Winfrey to  
17 explain portions of his report. *See* AR 584-587. Dr. Winfrey testified that Dr.  
18 Severinghaus’s testing was “very good” but that his test results simply did not  
19 reveal significant impairments. AR 584 (“There isn’t much wrong here”).  
20 Accordingly, Dr. Winfrey opined that, assuming the truth of Dr. Severinghaus’s

1 findings and opinions, Plaintiff did not have any work restrictions stemming from  
2 her mental impairment. AR 586.

3 Plaintiff first argues that Dr. Winfrey was not aware that Dr. Severinghaus  
4 diagnosed Plaintiff with posttraumatic stress disorder. ECF No. 12 at 15. However,  
5 Dr. Severinghaus only *suspected* PTSD. *See* AR 505. Dr. Winfrey acknowledged  
6 these suspicions but explained, “Yeah, that’s not a diagnosis.” AR 590.

7 Plaintiff also argues that Dr. Winfrey was not aware that treating physician  
8 Dr. Lahtinen documented Plaintiff’s depression and also agreed with Dr. Arnold’s  
9 findings. ECF No. 12 at 15-16. However, it is unclear how Dr. Winfrey’s  
10 awareness of or understanding of *Dr. Lahtinen’s* opinions is relevant. Plaintiff fails  
11 to explain how this has any bearing on the way the ALJ interpreted or credited Dr.  
12 Severinghaus’s opinion. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s contention that the ALJ failed to  
13 credit Dr. Severinghaus’s opinion is without merit.

14 **B. The ALJ did not Err in Weighing the Medical Opinion Evidence**

15 Plaintiff argues that the ALJ erred in evaluating and weighing the medical  
16 opinion evidence. ECF No. 12 at 16-17. However, Plaintiff does not provide any  
17 analysis or explanation as to why she believes the ALJ improperly considered or  
18 rejected any provider’s opinion. *Id.* Rather, Plaintiff articulates the standard for  
19 rejecting the contradicted testimony of a treating or examining doctor (the “specific  
20

1 and legitimate” standard) and then simply states, “here, that was not done.”<sup>3</sup> ECF  
2 No. 12 at 16.

3 The record, however, belies Plaintiff’s bald assertion. The ALJ, over eleven  
4 single-spaced pages, summarized Plaintiff’s voluminous treatment records and the  
5 findings and opinions of her many medical providers. *See* AR 552-562. The ALJ  
6 explained in detail which medical opinions he found persuasive, which ones he did  
7 not, and why he found each one either persuasive or unpersuasive. *See* AR 561-62.  
8 For example, the ALJ assigned great weight to the opinions of providers who had  
9 access to the longitudinal treatment record, who were specialists, who had  
10 extensive Social Security program knowledge, or who were subject to cross-  
11 examination. *See* AR 561. The ALJ gave less weight to the opinions of medical  
12 providers whose evaluations were connected to Plaintiff’s application for state  
13 welfare assistance, who gave opinions that conflicted with their own examination  
14 findings, who relied on invalid or embellished assessments, who failed to  
15 sufficiently explain their opinions, or who did not review Plaintiff’s historical  
16 treatment records. *See* AR 561-62. Thus, contrary to Plaintiff’s conclusory  
17 assertion, the ALJ set out a detailed and thorough summary of the facts and  
18  
19

---

20 <sup>3</sup> Plaintiff briefly mentions, without analysis or discussion, that the ALJ erred in  
discounting the opinions of Drs. Lahtinen and Arnold. ECF No. 12 at 15. However, the Court  
specifically considered and rejected these arguments in its prior remand order. *See* AR 670-672.



1 conflicting evidence, stated his interpretation thereof, and made findings. The ALJ  
2 therefore satisfied the “specific and legitimate” standard.

3 **VIII. Order**

4 Having reviewed the record and the ALJ’s findings, the Court finds the  
5 ALJ’s decision is supported by substantial evidence and is free from legal error.

6 Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 7 1. Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment, **ECF No. 12**, is **DENIED**.
- 8 2. Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment, **ECF No. 13**, is  
9 **GRANTED**.
- 10 3. Judgment shall be entered in favor of Defendant and the file shall be  
11 **CLOSED**.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is directed to enter this  
13 Order, forward copies to counsel, and **close the file**.

14 **DATED** this 30th day of December, 2019.

15 *s/Robert H. Whaley*  
16 **ROBERT H. WHALEY**  
Senior United States District Judge