

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
HARRISON DIVISION

WILLIAM P. OBPTANDE, III

PLAINTIFF

v.

CIVIL NO. 22-3020

KILOLO KIJAKAZI, Acting Commissioner
Social Security Administration

DEFENDANT

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, William P. Obptande, III, 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 claim for supplemental security income (SSI) benefits under the provisions of Title XVI of 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 SSI on August 26, 2019, alleging an inability to work due to bipolar disorder, depression and a learning disability. (Tr. 73, 174). An administrative telephonic hearing was held on December 3, 2020, at which Plaintiff appeared with counsel and testified. (Tr. 34-70).

By written decision dated February 2, 2021, the ALJ found that during the relevant time period, Plaintiff had an impairment or combination of impairments that were severe. (Tr. 19). Specifically, the ALJ found Plaintiff had the following severe impairments: chronic lower back pain syndrome, major depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). 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. 19). The ALJ found Plaintiff retained the residual functional capacity (RFC) to:

[P]erform light work as defined in 20 CFR 416.967(b) except that he can perform work consisting of simple tasks and simple instructions with few variables and little judgment, interpersonal contact that is only incidental, and supervision that is simple, direct, and concrete.

(Tr. 21). With the help of a vocational expert, the ALJ determined Plaintiff could perform work as a patch worker, a housekeeping cleaner, and an agricultural produce sorter. (Tr. 28).

Plaintiff then requested a review of the hearing decision by the Appeals Council, who denied that request on March 30, 2022. (Tr. 7-11). Subsequently, Plaintiff filed this action. (ECF No. 2). This case is before the undersigned pursuant to the consent of the parties. (ECF No. 5). Both parties have filed appeal briefs, and the case is now ready for decision. (ECF Nos. 14, 16).

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).

Plaintiff raises the following issue on appeal: 1) The ALJ erred in determining Plaintiff's RFC; 2) The ALJ erred in evaluating Plaintiff's subjective complaints by failing to discuss lay witness statements; and 3) The ALJ's decision is not supported by substantial evidence. (ECF. No 14). Defendant argues the ALJ properly considered all of the evidence and the decision is supported by substantial evidence. (ECF No. 16).

The Court has reviewed the entire transcript and the parties' briefs and finds that substantial evidence of record supports the ALJ's determination. The ALJ considered the medical assessments of the examining and non-examining agency medical consultants, Plaintiff's subjective complaints, and his medical records when he determined Plaintiff could perform light work with limitations. While Plaintiff disagrees with the ALJ's RFC determination, after reviewing the record as a whole the Court finds Plaintiff failed to meet his burden of showing a more restrictive RFC. *See Perks v. Astrue*, 687 F. 3d 1086, 1092 (8th Cir. 2012) (burden of persuasion to demonstrate RFC and prove disability remains on claimant). The Court finds substantial evidence supporting the ALJ's RFC determination for the time period in question.

For the reasons stated in the ALJ's well-reasoned opinion, the Court finds Plaintiff's arguments 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 7th day of August 2023.

1s/ Christy Comstock
HON. CHRISTY COMSTOCK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE