

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

TAMARA DEE MITCHELL,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:12-CV-0512-SLB
	)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,	)	
Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**


The plaintiff, Tamara Dee Mitchell, 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. Tamara Dee Mitchell filed an application for Social Security Benefits. 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. Accordingly, the decision of the Commissioner must be affirmed.

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

**DONE** and **ORDERED** this 14th day of January, 2013..

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SHARON LOVELACE BLACKBURN  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE