

United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eighth Circuit

---

No. 12-3799

---

Jason Joseph Slavicek

*Plaintiff - Appellant*

v.

Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of Social Security

*Defendant - Appellee*

---

Appeal from United States District Court  
for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis

---

Submitted: August 20, 2013

Filed: August 23, 2013

[Unpublished]

---

Before WOLLMAN, GRUENDER, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Jason Joseph Slavicek appeals the district court's<sup>1</sup> order affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits. Upon de novo review, see Van Vickle v. Astrue, 539

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Joan N. Erickson, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable Franklin L. Noel, United States Magistrate Judge for the District of Minnesota.

F.3d 825, 828 & n.2 (8th Cir. 2008), we find that the adverse decision at issue is supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole. Specifically, we find that the administrative law judge's (ALJ's) credibility determination is entitled to deference because it was based on several valid reasons, see Perks v. Astrue, 687 F.3d 1086, 1091 (8th Cir. 2012); that the ALJ also gave valid reasons for giving significant weight to the medical expert's opinion concerning Slavicek's residual functional capacity (RFC), see Renstrom v. Astrue, 680 F.3d 1057, 1064 (8th Cir. 2012) (treating physician's opinion does not automatically control, and is properly discounted when it is based on claimant's subjective complaints, not physician's own objective findings); and that the ALJ's RFC determination was supported by some medical evidence, as required, see Jones v. Astrue, 619 F.3d 963, 971 (8th Cir. 2010) (ALJ is responsible for determining RFC based on all relevant evidence, including medical records, observations of treating physicians and others, and claimant's own description of his limitations); see also Perks, 687 F.3d at 1092 (burden of persuasion to demonstrate RFC remains on claimant). The judgment is affirmed.

---