

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

John Lampshire v. Commissioner of Social Security

Lampshire v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 2:24-CV-3183-DC-DMC (E.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2025) · No. 2:24-CV-3183-DC-DMC · Decided November 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The document contains findings and recommendations in John Lampshire’s action for judicial review of a Social Security disability determination under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The court evaluates challenges to the ALJ’s treatment of medical opinions and recommends affirming the Commissioner’s decision, concluding that the ALJ’s residual functional capacity assessment was consistent with the medical evidence and that the treatment of the opinions was adequately explained.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dennis M. Cota
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 21, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-CV-3183-DC-DMC
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Findings and recommendations on the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment in an action for judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Commissioner’s final decision is reviewed for application of proper legal standards and support by substantial evidence in the record as a whole. Substantial evidence is more than a mere scintilla but less than a preponderance; when evidence is susceptible to more than one rational interpretation, the Commissioner’s interpretation must be upheld.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; findings and recommendations from a federal district court, with no reporter citation
PARTIES	John Lampshire v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

agency adjudication

administrative law

ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ improperly evaluated Dr. J. Allen’s medical opinions by finding them persuasive while adopting a residual functional capacity for limited light work despite Dr. Allen’s statement that the claimant was capable of sedentary work.
2. Whether the ALJ improperly discounted Dr. Jane Addagatta’s opinion because it was prepared after the claimant’s date last insured.
3. Whether the ALJ’s evaluation of the medical opinions was supported by substantial evidence and adequate reasoning under the revised medical-opinion regulations.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ did not reversibly err by finding Dr. Allen’s opinions persuasive and adopting a limited-light-work residual functional capacity. Although Dr. Allen used the term sedentary in one report, the specific limitations he assessed were consistent with light work involving sitting most of the day and unrestricted upper- and lower-extremity manipulation.
2. The ALJ properly discounted Dr. Addagatta’s 2023 opinion because it was outside the relevant period, was more restrictive than Dr. Allen’s opinions, and was less consistent with the record as a whole.
3. The Commissioner’s final decision should be affirmed because the ALJ applied proper legal standards and the challenged findings were supported by substantial evidence.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Notwithstanding Dr. Allen’s use of the word “sedentary” in one of two reports, Dr. Allen’s findings in both reports are entirely consistent with the definition of light work involving mostly sitting with no limitations on arm-hand and/or leg-foot manipulative activities.” (at 11)

“Thus, the ALJ properly discounted Dr. Addagatta’s 2023 opinion as not describing Plaintiff’s abilities during the relevant time period between 2015 and 2018.” (at 13)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Lampshire alleged disability from diabetes mellitus, diabetic neuropathy, obesity, varicose veins, sleep apnea, and depressive disorder during the period ending March 31, 2018, his date last insured. The ALJ found these impairments severe but concluded that they did not meet or equal a listed impairment and that Lampshire retained the residual functional capacity for a limited range of light work, including standing or walking for four hours and sitting for six hours in an eight-hour day. The ALJ relied in part on opinions from Dr. J. Allen and rejected a more restrictive opinion from Dr. Jane Addagatta. Lampshire argued that the ALJ inconsistently characterized Dr. Allen’s opinion and discounted Addagatta’s opinion based on its date.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Lampshire applied for Social Security benefits on December 5, 2022, alleging disability beginning December 5, 2015. After the claim was denied initially and on reconsideration, an administrative hearing was held before ALJ Christopher Knowdell on May 30, 2024. The ALJ issued a decision on July 26, 2024, finding Lampshire not disabled through his date last insured, March 31, 2018. The Appeals Council denied review on September 30, 2024. Lampshire then sought judicial review, and the magistrate judge recommends denying his motion for summary judgment, granting the Commissioner's cross-motion, and affirming the Commissioner's decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Tackett v. Apfel, 180 F.3d 1094, 1097 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Saelee v. Chater, 94 F.3d 520, 521 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389, 402 (1971)
- Howard v. Heckler, 782 F.2d 1484, 1487 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Jones v. Heckler, 760 F.2d 993, 995 (9th Cir. 1985)
- Hammock v. Bowen, 879 F.2d 498, 501 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Sprague v. Bowen, 812 F.2d 1226, 1229-30 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Thomas v. Barnhart, 278 F.3d 947, 954, 957 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Burkhart v. Bowen, 856 F.2d 1335, 1338, 1340 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Quang Van Han v. Bower, 882 F.2d 1453, 1456 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Terry v. Sullivan, 903 F.2d 1273, 1275 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Gallant v. Heckler, 753 F.2d 1450, 1452 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Hoffman v. Heckler, 785 F.2d 1423, 1425 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Hammock v. Bowen, 867 F.2d 1209, 1212-1213 (9th Cir. 1989)
- David P. v. Saul, No. 19-cv-01506-BEN-AHG, 2020 WL 4593311, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2020)
- Politte v. Kijakazi, No. 21-55341, 2021 WL 5860767 (9th Cir. Aug. 10, 2021)
- Brand v. Kijakazi, 575 F. Supp. 3d 1265, 1269 (D. Nev. 2021)
- Digiacomo v. Saul, No. 19-cv-00494-BAM, 2020 WL 6318207, at *8 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2020)
- Romero v. Kijakazi, No. 2:21-CV-0213 DB, 2022 WL 1093556, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 12, 2022)
- Kathleen G. v. Commissioner of Social Security, Case No. C20-461 RSM, 2020 WL 6581012, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 10, 2020)
- Kramer v. Kijakazi, Case No. 20cv2065 GPC (AHG), 2022 WL 873630, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2022)
- Tommasetti v. Astrue, 533 F.3d 1035, 1041 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Garrison v. Colvin, 759 F.3d 995, 1012 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Molina v. Astrue, 674 F.3d 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2012)

- *Tonapetyan v. Halter*, 242 F.3d 1144, 1149 (9th Cir. 2001)
- *Turner v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 613 F.3d 1217, 1223-24 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Dale v. Colvin*, 823 F.3d 941, 943 (9th Cir. 2016)
- *Popa v. Berryhill*, 872 F.3d 901, 906 (9th Cir. 2017)
- *Revels v. Berryhill*, 874 F.3d 648, 655 (9th Cir. 2017)
- *Jones v. Saul*, 2021 WL 620475, at *9 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 17, 2021)
- *Carr v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 2021 WL 1721692, at *7 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2021)
- *Buethe v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 2021 WL 1966202, at *3-*4 (E.D. Cal. May 17, 2021)
- *Edlund v. Massanari*, 253 F.3d 1152, 1156 (9th Cir. 2001)
- *Rounds v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration*, 807 F.3d 996, 1006 (9th Cir. 2015)
- *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991)