

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
FORT SMITH DIVISION

RICKEY DOOLEY

PLAINTIFF

v.

CIVIL NO. 20-2063

ANDREW M. SAUL, Commissioner  
Social Security Administration

DEFENDANT

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Plaintiff, Rickey Dooley, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), seeking judicial review of a decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (Commissioner) denying his claims for a period of disability and disability insurance benefits (DIB) under the provisions of Title II the Social Security Act (Act). In this judicial review, the Court must determine whether there is substantial evidence in the administrative record to support the Commissioner's decision. See 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

Plaintiff protectively filed his current application for DIB on December 8, 2017, alleging an inability to work since December 8, 2017,<sup>1</sup> due to residuals of a torn bicep in the right arm; no grip in the right hand; an inability to lift with the right, dominant hand; no strength in the right arm; and diabetes. (Tr. 142-143, 223, 309). An administrative hearing was held on July 23, 2019, at which Plaintiff appeared with counsel and testified. (Tr. 104-127).

By written decision dated September 30, 2019, the ALJ found that during the relevant time period, Plaintiff had an impairment or combination of impairments that were severe. (Tr. 13).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes Plaintiff's application indicates the alleged onset of disability date is January 11, 2018. (Tr. 223). However, the Disability Determination Explanation (Reconsideration) indicates Plaintiff's alleged onset of disability is December 8, 2017. (Tr. 142, 271). The ALJ used the earlier alleged onset of disability date in the administrative decision.

Specifically, the ALJ found Plaintiff had the following severe impairments: skin cancer, diabetes mellitus, gout, a right shoulder dysfunction, a kidney disorder, and a disease of the liver. However, after reviewing all of the evidence presented, the ALJ determined that Plaintiff's impairments did not meet or equal the level of severity of any impairment listed in the Listing of Impairments found in Appendix I, Subpart P, Regulation No. 4. (Tr. 14). The ALJ found Plaintiff retained the residual functional capacity (RFC) to:

perform light work as defined in 20 CFR 404.1567(b) except that he can frequently reach overhead with the right dominant upper extremity.

(Tr. 15). With the help of a vocational expert, the ALJ determined Plaintiff could return to his past relevant work as a chart changer, as generally performed. (Tr. 19).

Plaintiff then requested a review of the hearing decision by the Appeals Council, which after reviewing additional evidence submitted by Plaintiff denied that request on March 14, 2020. (Tr. 1-5). Subsequently, Plaintiff filed this action. (Doc. 2). This case is before the undersigned pursuant to the consent of the parties. (Doc. 6). Both parties have filed appeal briefs, and the case is now ready for decision. (Docs. 12, 13).

This Court's role is to determine whether the Commissioner's findings are supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole. Ramirez v. Barnhart, 292 F.3d 576, 583 (8th Cir. 2002). Substantial evidence is less than a preponderance but it is enough that a reasonable mind would find it adequate to support the Commissioner's decision. The ALJ's decision must be affirmed if the record contains substantial evidence to support it. Edwards v. Barnhart, 314 F.3d 964, 966 (8th Cir. 2003). As long as there is substantial evidence in the record that supports the Commissioner's decision, the Court may not reverse it simply because substantial evidence exists in the record that would have supported a contrary outcome, or because the Court would have decided the case differently. Haley v. Massanari, 258 F.3d 742, 747 (8th Cir. 2001). In other

words, if after reviewing the record it is possible to draw two inconsistent positions from the evidence and one of those positions represents the findings of the ALJ, the decision of the ALJ must be affirmed. Young v. Apfel, 221 F.3d 1065, 1068 (8th Cir. 2000).

The Court has reviewed the entire transcript and the parties' briefs. For the reasons stated in the ALJ's well-reasoned opinion and the Government's brief, the Court finds Plaintiff's arguments on appeal to be without merit and finds that the record as a whole reflects substantial evidence to support the ALJ's decision. Accordingly, the ALJ's decision is hereby summarily affirmed and Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed with prejudice. See Sledge v. Astrue, No. 08-0089, 2008 WL 4816675 (W.D. Mo. Oct. 31, 2008) (summarily affirming ALJ's denial of disability benefits), aff'd, 364 Fed. Appx. 307 (8th Cir. 2010).

DATED this 23rd day of December 2020.

/s/ Erin L. Wiedemann  
HON. ERIN L. WIEDEMANN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE