

DEC 10 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CAROLYN MCCOY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of
Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-56250

D.C. No. 2:08-cv-04217-SS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Suzanne H. Segal, Magistrate Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 7, 2010**
Pasadena, California

Before: PREGERSON, CLIFTON, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Appellant Carolyn McCoy (“McCoy”) challenges the district court’s decision upholding the Appellee Commissioner of Social Security’s determination that McCoy was not disabled.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

The ALJ chose to adopt the non-treating physician's conclusions because they accurately reflected the medical evidence. The ALJ found that, based on the objective medical evidence, the majority of medical conditions which formed the basis for the treating physician's functional assessment did not impair McCoy because the conditions were being successfully treated or had been resolved. Thus, the treating physician's conclusions were not supported by the medical records.

The ALJ's statements regarding the medical evidence as it related to the conflicting medical opinions provided a specific and legitimate explanation for rejecting the treating physician's conclusions. *See Andrews v. Shalala*, 53 F.3d 1035, 1043 (9th Cir. 1995); *Magallanes v. Bowen*, 881 F.2d 747, 751 (9th Cir. 1989). Furthermore, the ALJ summarized all of the facts and conflicting clinical evidence from multiple sources in a detailed and thorough fashion, stating his interpretation and making findings. *See Id.* Therefore, the ALJ's decision was supported by substantial evidence and correctly applied the applicable law. *See Valentine v. Commissioner*, 574 F.3d 685, 690 (9th Cir. 2009). **AFFIRMED.**