

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Manesha F. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

Manesha F. v. Bisignano, Case No. 25-cv-849 (JRT/DJF) (D. Minn. Jan. 15, 2026) · No. 25-cv-849 (JRT/DJF);
0:25-cv-00849 · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The document is a Report and Recommendation from the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota concerning judicial review of the denial of Manesha F.'s applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. The court recommends affirming the Commissioner's decision, concluding that the ALJ adequately evaluated the claimant's mental and physical impairments, developed a sufficient record without ordering a consultative examination, and sufficiently considered the state agency consultants' opinions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Minnesota
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dulce J. Foster
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Minnesota
DECIDED	January 15, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-849 (JRT/DJF); 0:25-cv-00849
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Report and recommendation on judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying Plaintiff's applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Whether the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole and whether the ALJ applied the proper legal standards. The court must affirm when the record permits two inconsistent positions and one is the ALJ's finding, but may remand when the ALJ's findings are insufficient to permit meaningful judicial review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Manesha F. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

disability definition

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

disability benefits

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's assessment of the limiting effects and episodic nature of Plaintiff's bipolar disorder.
2. Whether the ALJ erred by denying Plaintiff's request for an additional consultative psychological examination.
3. Whether the ALJ adequately evaluated the supportability and consistency of the state-agency medical consultants' opinions.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ did not err in declining to impose additional residual-functional-capacity limitations based on Plaintiff's psychiatric hospitalizations, therapist note, and treating psychiatrist's checkbox forms because substantial evidence supported the ALJ's conclusion that the hospitalizations were isolated episodes associated with treatment noncompliance and that the broader treatment record generally showed controlled symptoms and normal mental-status findings.
2. The ALJ did not err by declining to order an additional consultative psychological examination because the existing record contained substantial evidence supporting the disability determination and the ALJ reasonably found that the later hospitalizations and checkbox forms did not demonstrate an unmanaged deterioration requiring further examination.
3. The ALJ's brief discussion of the supportability and consistency of the state-agency consultants' opinions did not require reversal because the decision, read as a whole, made clear that the ALJ considered those factors, thoroughly reviewed the same evidence relied on by the consultants, adopted the more favorable medical opinion, and imposed restrictions exceeding those recommended by the psychological consultants.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Though the ALJ's analyses of these opinions are anemic, the Court does not believe they are so deficient as to warrant reversal." (R. 29-31)

"At its core, Plaintiff's issue with the ALJ's analysis is not that the ALJ failed to conduct a thorough analysis of the medical consultants' opinions; rather, Plaintiff does not believe the ALJ should have relied on any of the medical consultants' opinions in creating Plaintiff's RFC." (R. 29-31)

"The Court is therefore unpersuaded that the ALJ erred in denying Plaintiff's request." (R. 30-31)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff applied for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income based on bipolar disorder, chronic pain and other physical impairments. The ALJ found numerous severe impairments, including bipolar disorder with psychosis and generalized anxiety disorder, but determined that Plaintiff retained the residual functional capacity for restricted light work involving simple, routine, and repetitive tasks. Plaintiff had three brief psychiatric hospitalizations associated with noncompliance with psychotropic medication, while treatment records outside those episodes generally documented normal affect and thought processes. The ALJ found that Plaintiff could not perform her past relevant work but could perform several other jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Social Security Administration denied Plaintiff's applications initially and on reconsideration. After a hearing, the ALJ issued a decision finding Plaintiff not disabled under the five-step sequential evaluation, and the Appeals Council denied review. Plaintiff sought review in the District of Minnesota, arguing that the ALJ failed to account for the episodic nature of her bipolar disorder, failed to develop the record by denying a consultative examination, and inadequately evaluated the supportability and consistency of state-agency medical opinions. The magistrate judge recommended denying Plaintiff's relief, granting the Commissioner's relief, affirming the ALJ's decision, and dismissing the complaint with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was recommended. The magistrate judge recommended affirming the Commissioner's decision and dismissing the complaint with prejudice.

CASES CITED

- Young v. Apfel, 221 F.3d 1065, 1069 n.5 (8th Cir. 2000)
- Bowen v. Yuckert, 482 U.S. 137, 146 n.5 (1987)
- McKinney v. Apfel, 228 F.3d 860, 863 (8th Cir. 2000)
- Biestek v. Berryhill, 139 S. Ct. 1148, 1154 (2019)
- Consol. Edison Co. v. NLRB, 305 U.S. 197, 229 (1938)
- Perks v. Astrue, 687 F.3d 1086, 1091 (8th Cir. 2012)
- Scott ex rel. Scott v. Astrue, 529 F.3d 818, 822 (8th Cir. 2008)
- Chunn v. Barnhart, 397 F.3d 667, 672 (8th Cir. 2005)
- Lee R. v. Kijakazi, No. 20-cv-1989 (BRT), 2022 WL 673259, at *4 (D. Minn. Mar. 7, 2022)
- Weber v. Colvin, No. 16-cv-332 (JNE/TNL), 2017 WL 477099, at *26 (D. Minn. Jan. 26, 2019)
- Brace v. Astrue, 578 F.3d 882, 885 (8th Cir. 2009)
- Clay v. Barnhart, 417 F.3d 922, 928 (8th Cir. 2005)
- Freeman v. Apfel, 208 F.3d 687, 692 (8th Cir. 2000)

- *Darris v. Saul*, No. 3:20-cv-42 (BSM/JTR), 2020 WL 5543346, at *2-3 (E.D. Ark. Sept. 16, 2020)
- *Admaczyk v. Saul*, 817 F. App'x 287, 290 (8th Cir. 2020)
- *Byes v. Astrue*, 687 F.3d 913, 916 (8th Cir. 2012)
- *Cropper v. Dudek*, 136 F.4th 809, 813-15 (8th Cir. 2025)
- *Mario O. v. Kijakazi*, No. 21-cv-2469 (NEB/ECW), 2022 WL 18157524, at *11 (D. Minn. Dec. 13, 2022)
- *Lucus v. Saul*, 960 F.3d 1066, 1069 (8th Cir. 2020)
- *Hensley v. Colvin*, 829 F.3d 926, 932 (8th Cir. 2016)
- *Austin v. Kijakazi*, 52 F.4th 723, 729 (8th Cir. 2022)
- *Troy L. M. v. Kijakazi*, No. 21-cv-199 (TNL), 2022 WL 4540107, at *12 (D. Minn. Sept. 28, 2022)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-minnesota/2026/manesha-f-v-frank-bisignano-commissioner-of-social-security-2qfc5khy>