

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

M.E.G. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of the Social Security
Administration

M.E.G. v. Bisignano · No. CIV-25-665-STE · Decided January 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma reviewed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of the plaintiff’s application for disability insurance benefits. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge failed to discuss significantly probative evidence from a consultative examiner concerning the plaintiff’s ability to walk and stand. The court reversed and remanded the Commissioner’s decision for further proceedings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Shon T. Erwin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	January 26, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-25-665-STE
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying Social Security disability insurance benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed whether the Commissioner applied the correct legal standards and whether the agency's factual findings were supported by substantial evidence. The court could not reweigh the evidence or substitute its judgment for that of the agency.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unreported district-court memorandum opinion; nonprecedential
PARTIES	M.E.G. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

agency adjudication

administrative law

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ failed to consider significantly probative and uncontroverted evidence from consultative examiner Megan Ewing concerning Plaintiff's ability to walk and stand when determining the residual functional capacity.
2. Whether the ALJ improperly evaluated prior administrative findings from Dr. James Metcalf concerning Plaintiff's ability to perform light work.
3. Whether the ALJ improperly analyzed Plaintiff's subjective allegations.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ committed reversible legal error by failing to discuss significantly probative and uncontroverted findings from consultative examiner Megan Ewing that were directly relevant to Plaintiff's ability to walk and stand.
2. The court rejected Plaintiff's challenge to the ALJ's consideration of Dr. Metcalf's prior administrative finding.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"This Court reviews the Commissioner's final decision "to determin[e] whether the Commissioner applied the correct legal standards and whether the agency's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence."" (Section IV)

"Here, the ALJ did not explain why she rejected significantly probative and uncontroverted evidence in the record related to Plaintiff's ability to walk and/or stand. This constitutes reversible error." (Section V.B.)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged disability beginning January 1, 2022, with a date last insured of September 30, 2023. The ALJ found severe impairments including chronic pain syndrome, kidney disease, Raynaud's disease, neuropathy, arthritis, degenerative disc disease, and status post left inguinal hernia repair, but determined that Plaintiff retained the residual functional capacity for a reduced range of light work. In evaluating a consultative examination, the ALJ discussed an antalgic but steady gait and some hand findings but did not address additional findings concerning bilateral foot pain, pain preventing straight-leg testing, and inability to heel-walk or toe-walk due to instability.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Social Security Administration denied Plaintiff's applications initially and on reconsideration. After an administrative hearing, an Administrative Law Judge issued an unfavorable decision, and the Appeals Council

denied review. The district court reviewed the administrative record and reversed and remanded the Commissioner's decision.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The Commissioner must reconsider the case on remand, including the significantly probative evidence from consultative examiner Megan Ewing concerning Plaintiff's ability to walk and stand. The court did not reach the remaining allegation of error because it could be affected by the ALJ's treatment of the case on remand.

CASES CITED

- 431 F.3d 729, 731 (10th Cir. 2005)
- 109 F. App'x 321, 327, 2004 WL 2095612, at *5 (10th Cir. 2004)
- 952 F.3d 1172, 1177 (10th Cir. 2020)
- 139 S. Ct. 1148, 1154 (2019)
- 805 F.3d 1199, 1201 (10th Cir. 2015)
- 79 F.3d 1007, 1010 (10th Cir. 1996)
- 922 F.3d 1169, 1172-73 (10th Cir. 2019)
- 482 F.3d 1205, 1208 (10th Cir. 2007)
- 537 F.3d 1264, 1266-67 (10th Cir. 2008)
- 350 F.3d 1297, 1299 (10th Cir. 2003)