

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 19-2675

Crystal Mae Moore

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Andrew Saul, Commissioner, Social Security Administration

Defendant - Appellee

Appeal from United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Missouri - Cape Girardeau

Submitted: April 23, 2020

Filed: May 22, 2020

[Unpublished]

Before COLLOTON, BEAM, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Crystal Moore appeals the district court's¹ order affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. After consideration of Moore's arguments for reversal, we agree with the court that substantial evidence in the record as a whole supports the adverse decision. See Nash v. Comm'r, Soc. Sec. Admin., 907 F.3d 1086, 1089 (8th Cir. 2018) (de novo review of district court's judgment; Commissioner's decision will be upheld if it is supported by substantial evidence in record as whole). Specifically, we find that the administrative law judge (ALJ) adequately considered the combined effects of Moore's impairments, see Martise v. Astrue, 641 F.3d 909, 924 (8th Cir. 2011) (ALJ properly considered combined effects of claimant's impairments by expressly finding that she did not have "impairment or combination of impairments" that satisfied listings, and discussing medical evidence regarding each of her impairments); and cited proper reasons in finding her subjective complaints not fully consistent with the overall record, see Swink v. Saul, 931 F.3d 765, 771 (8th Cir. 2019) (ALJ's credibility determination, which analyzed objective findings on examination, diagnostic imaging results, and claimant's daily activities, was supported by substantial evidence). We find that the hypothetical questions posed to the vocational expert were not deficient, as Moore's argument for greater limitations relies largely on her subjective reports, which the ALJ properly discounted. See Schwandt v. Berryhill, 926 F.3d 1004, 1013 (8th Cir. 2019) (substantial evidence supported ALJ's omission of additional limitations from claimant's residual functional capacity, as those limitations were based on claimant's testimony and were undermined by other evidence of record).

The judgment is affirmed.

¹The Honorable John M. Bodenhausen, 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).