

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>CHRISTINE JANE ORTEGA,</p> <p>Plaintiff-Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>KILOLO KIJAKAZI, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,</p> <p>Defendant-Appellee.</p>
--

No. 19-35028

D.C. No. 3:17-cv-01988-BR

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Anna J. Brown, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 7, 2021**

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, and HAWKINS and McKEOWN, Circuit Judges.

Christine Ortega appeals the district court’s judgment affirming the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of her application for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income under Titles II and XVI of the

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

Social Security Act. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review the district court's judgment de novo. *Ford v. Saul*, 950 F.3d 1141, 1153-54 (9th Cir. 2020). We affirm.

Ortega's testimony regarding the amounts of sitting, standing, and walking required in her past relevant work as a delivery driver provided substantial evidence in support of the administrative law judge's ("ALJ") finding that the work was sedentary as actually performed. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1567(a), 416.967(a) (defining sedentary work). *See also Coleman v. Saul*, 979 F.3d 751, 755 (9th Cir. 2020) (defining substantial evidence). Accordingly, substantial evidence supports the ALJ's finding, at Step Four of the sequential analysis, that Ortega could perform her past relevant work as actually performed, and she therefore was not disabled. *See* 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520(a)(4)(iv), 416.920(a)(4)(iv). *See also Ford*, 950 F.3d at 1149.

AFFIRMED.