

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

EBONE UNIQUE CRAIG,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-G-2617-S
)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,)	
Commissioner of the Social)	
Security Administration,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION


The plaintiff, Ebone Unique Craig, brings this action seeking judicial review of a final adverse decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (the Commissioner) denying her application for Social Security Benefits. The plaintiff filed an application for Social Security Benefits on November 28, 2007. Thereafter, plaintiff timely pursued and exhausted the administrative remedies available before the Commissioner. Accordingly, this case is now ripe for judicial review pursuant to the provisions of section 205(g) of the Social Security Act (the Act), 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

The sole function of this court is to determine whether the decision of the Commissioner is supported by substantial evidence and whether proper legal standards were applied. Bloodsworth v. Heckler, 703 F.2d 1233, 1239 (11th Cir. 1983). To that

end this court “must scrutinize the record as a whole to determine if the decision reached is reasonable and supported by substantial evidence.” Bloodsworth, at 1239 (citations omitted). Substantial evidence is “such relevant evidence as a reasonable person would accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” Bloodsworth, at 1239. The court has carefully reviewed the entire record in this case and is of the opinion that the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence and that proper legal standards were applied in reaching that decision.¹ Accordingly, the decision of the Commissioner must be affirmed.

A separate order in conformity with this memorandum opinion will be entered.

DONE and ORDERED 16 April 2012.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
J. FOY GUIN, JR.

¹ In her brief, the plaintiff argues that administrative law judge “failed to fulfill his duty” of performing a disability determination. [Pl.’s Br. At 8]. However, the ALJ clearly followed the five-step sequential process and correctly found that the plaintiff did not have a medically determinable impairment. [R. 49]. Moreover, the plaintiff has made no showing that the decision of the Commissioner was unreasonable or not supported by substantial evidence, or that on remand the administrative result would likely change. This is clearly a weak case for the plaintiff, so weak that the attorney for the plaintiff should have thoughtfully considered not filing this appeal.