United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

	No. 11-1184
Geneva K. Bellinger,	*
	*
Appellant, v.	*
	* Appeal from the United States* District Court for the Eastern
	* District Court for the Eastern* District of Missouri.
Michael J. Astrue,	*
Social Security Commissioner,	* [UNPUBLISHED] *
Appellee.	*

Submitted: August 2, 2011 Filed: August 23, 2011

Before LOKEN, BYE, and COLLOTON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Geneva K. Bellinger appeals the district court's¹ order affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. Upon de novo review, <u>see Martise v. Astrue</u>, 641 F.3d 909, 920-21 (8th Cir. 2011), we conclude that Bellinger has raised no basis for reversal. Specifically, the administrative law judge (ALJ) did not err by declining to find Bellinger's plantar fasciitis a severe

¹The Honorable Mary Ann Medler, United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, to whom the case was referred for final disposition by consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

impairment, <u>see Kirby v. Astrue</u>, 500 F.3d 705, 707-08 (8th Cir. 2007) (impairment is not severe if it amounts only to slight abnormality that would not significantly limit claimant's physical ability to do basic work activities; it is claimant's burden to establish his impairment is severe); and he properly developed the record by arranging for medical and psychological consultative examinations following the hearing. Further, the ALJ's determination of Bellinger's residual functional capacity was based on consideration of her medical records, observations of treating physicians and others, and Bellinger's own description of her limitations, and it was also supported by some medical evidence, as required. <u>See Jones v. Astrue</u>, 619 F.3d 963, 971 (8th Cir. 2010). Finally, the vocational expert's testimony in response the ALJ's properly formulated hypothetical constituted substantial evidence that Bellinger was not disabled. <u>See Partee v. Astrue</u>, 638 F.3d 860, 865 (8th Cir. 2011). The district court is affirmed.