

(Doc. 17 at p. 26.) Plaintiff argues that the use of “has had” is the present perfect tense which is used “to express actions . . . that began in the past and continue in the present.” (Doc. 20 at 3.) Plaintiff further argues if the ALJ had only used the word “had,” he would have been referring to limitations which existed in the past but no longer existed. (*Id.*)

In an imperfect world, the present perfect tense is used less than perfectly. Accordingly, word combinations take on a common sense usage, or colloquialisms; thus, “has had” – to many speakers – means past tense. In any event, the “has had” finding is qualified by the last clause, “but has not had any episodes of decompensation of an extended duration,” which implies there has not been any ongoing difficulties with concentration, persistence, or pace.

Furthermore, the ALJ incorporated Plaintiff’s limitations by including in the hypothetical posed to the expert the restrictions of simple, routine, sedentary work tasks of an unskilled nature in a stable work environment. This hypothetical adequately conveyed Plaintiff’s limitations. *See Menkes v. Astrue*, 262 F. Appx. 410, 412 (3d Cir. 2008).

Thus, this court did not misinterpret the findings of the ALJ. An appropriate order will be issued.

s/Sylvia H. Rambo
United States District Judge

Dated: May 22, 2014.