

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-2574

Joshua Ray Puffinbarger,

Appellant,

v.

Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of
Social Security,

Appellee.

*
*
*
* Appeal from the United States
* District Court for the
* Southern District of Iowa.
*
* [UNPUBLISHED]
*
*

Submitted: March 24, 2010

Filed: April 30, 2010

Before RILEY,¹ Chief Judge, BYE, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Joshua Ray Puffinbarger appeals the district court's² order affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. Puffinbarger alleged disability from, among other things, arthritis, herniated discs in his neck and back, and carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS). After a hearing, an administrative law judge

¹The Honorable William Jay Riley became Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit on April 1, 2010.

²The Honorable Charles R. Wolle, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa.

(ALJ) determined that (1) Puffinbarger's combined impairments--degenerative disc disease, CTS, diabetes, hypertension, depression, personality disorder, and history of kidney stones and rotator-cuff injury--were severe, but did not meet or equal the requirements of any listing alone or combined; (2) his subjective complaints were not entirely credible; and (3) based on the testimony of a vocational expert, Puffinbarger's residual functional capacity (RFC) did not preclude his past relevant work as an inspector or security guard. The Appeals Council denied review, and the district court affirmed. After de novo review of the record, see Davidson v. Astrue, 578 F.3d 838, 841-42 (8th Cir. 2009) (standard of review), we affirm.

We reject Puffinbarger's challenges to the ALJ's credibility findings, as those findings were based on multiple valid reasons. See Finch v. Astrue, 547 F.3d 933, 935-36 (8th Cir. 2008) (where ALJ explicitly discredits claimant and gives good reasons for doing so, courts will normally defer to his judgment); see also Gowell v. Apfel, 242 F.3d 793, 796 (8th Cir. 2001) (real issue is severity of claimant's pain). We also find that the ALJ's determination of Puffinbarger's physical RFC is supported by substantial evidence. See Moore v. Astrue, 572 F.3d 520, 523 (8th Cir. 2009) (considerations in RFC determination); Goff v. Barnhart, 421 F.3d 785, 790 (8th Cir. 2005) (burden is on claimant to establish RFC).

Accordingly, we affirm.
