## United States Court of Appeals For the Eighth Circuit

No. 15-2224

Brian Billings

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of Social Security

Defendant - Appellee

Appeal from United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas - Batesville

\_\_\_\_\_

Submitted: March 7, 2016 Filed: March 18, 2016 [Unpublished]

\_\_\_\_\_

Before LOKEN, MURPHY, and BYE, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM.

Appellate Case: 15-2224 Page: 1 Date Filed: 03/18/2016 Entry ID: 4379264<sub>Dockets.Justia.com</sub>

Brian Billings appeals the district court's¹ order affirming the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income, after his hearing before an administrative law judge (ALJ). For reversal, Billings argues that the ALJ's decision is not supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole, and in particular, he challenges the ALJ's severity and credibility determinations; the ALJ's residual functional capacity (RFC) finding; and the ALJ's decision to credit some physicians' opinions in the record over other physician's opinions, including the opinion of consultative medical examiner Anandaraj Subramanium, M.D.

Following careful de novo review, we conclude that substantial evidence in the record as a whole supports the denial of Billings's applications, see <u>Halverson v. Astrue</u>, 600 F.3d 922, 929-31(8th Cir. 2010) (standard of review), including the ALJ's determination on which impairments were severe, see <u>Kirby v. Astrue</u>, 500 F.3d 705, 707-08 (8th Cir. 2007); the credibility determinations, see <u>Perks v. Astrue</u>, 687 F.3d 1086, 1092-93 (8th Cir. 2012); the assessment of RFC, see <u>id.</u> at 1092; and the decision to discount Dr. Subramanium's opinion on the severity of Billings's limitations, see <u>Estes v. Barnhart</u>, 275 F.3d 722, 725 (8th Cir. 2002).

The judgment of the district court is affirmed. See 8th Cir. R. 47F
---

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Joe J. Volpe, United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, to whom the case was referred for final disposition by consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).