

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Vincent Bernard Davis v. Commissioner of Social Security

Davis v. Commissioner of Social Security · No. 2:24-cv-01874 CKD · Decided August 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The Eastern District of California upheld the Commissioner of Social Security’s determination that Vincent Bernard Davis’s disability ended on March 1, 2020. The court rejected challenges concerning the ALJ’s treatment of psychological consultant opinions and the evaluation of Davis’s subjective symptom testimony. Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment was denied, the Commissioner’s cross-motion was granted, and judgment was ordered for the Commissioner.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Carolyn K. Delaney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 1, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-01874 CKD
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's final decision finding that his disability ended on March 1, 2020. The parties consented to magistrate judge jurisdiction and filed cross-motions for summary judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews the Commissioner's decision under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for application of proper legal standards and substantial evidence in the record as a whole. The court upholds an ALJ's conclusion when the evidence is susceptible to more than one rational interpretation and may set it aside only when an improper legal standard was applied.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Vincent Bernard Davis v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

summary judgment

disability definition

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated and incorporated the moderate limitations identified by psychological consultant Dr. L. Colsky, particularly the limitation concerning completing a normal workday or workweek without interruption from psychological symptoms.
2. Whether the ALJ provided legally sufficient, specific, clear, and convincing reasons for discounting plaintiff's subjective symptom testimony.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ did not commit reversible error by adopting most of Dr. Colsky's opinion and translating the narrative limitations into the residual functional capacity. Although the ALJ should have expressly adopted or rejected the moderate limitation concerning completing a normal workday and workweek without interruption, the opinion as a whole rationally supported the ALJ's conclusion that plaintiff could perform simple, repetitive work with limited public interaction and other restrictions.
2. The ALJ provided legally sufficient specific, clear, and convincing reasons for discounting plaintiff's testimony concerning the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of his symptoms.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When an ALJ accords substantial or great weight to a physician’s opinion, he must either incorporate their findings into the RFC or offer an explanation for why he chose not to accept them.” (at 26)

“In sum, the ALJ provided more than an overview of the medical history and a boilerplate conclusion that plaintiffs testimony was inconsistent with the record. Rather, he pointed to specific evidence and explained why it called certain of plaintiff's statements into question.” (at 24-25)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was found disabled in 2016 based on a severe psychotic disorder involving auditory hallucinations, memory loss, depression, and difficulty managing anger. After a continuing disability review, the Commissioner determined that medical improvement occurred by March 1, 2020, although plaintiff continued to have a severe impairment. The ALJ found that plaintiff retained the capacity for simple, routine, repetitive work with limited public interaction and other nonexertional restrictions, and that his symptoms were less severe than alleged based on generally normal mental-status examinations, improvement with medication, and daily activities.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Commissioner initially found plaintiff disabled in 2016. Following a continuing disability review, the Commissioner determined in March 2020 that plaintiff was no longer disabled; reconsideration was denied in 2022. After two administrative hearings, the ALJ again found that plaintiff's disability ended on March 1, 2020. The district court denied plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, granted the Commissioner's cross-motion, and directed entry of judgment for the Commissioner.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Lambert v. Saul, 980 F.3d 1266, 1268, 1277-78 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Tackett v. Apfel, 180 F.3d 1094, 1097 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Edlund v. Massanari, 253 F.3d 1152, 1156 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Tommasetti v. Astrue, 533 F.3d 1035, 1038 (9th Cir. 2008)
- 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)
- Burkhardt v. Bowen, 856 F.2d 1335, 1338 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Rounds v. Comm'r Soc. Sec. Admin., 807 F.3d 996, 1006 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Garrison v. Colvin, 759 F.3d 995, 1012 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Milavong v. Comm'r, No. 1:24-cv-00278-JLT-BAM, 2025 WL 553341, *4, *6 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2025)
- Harrell v. Kijakazi, No. 1:20-cv-00614-GSA, 2021 WL 4429416, *6 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2021)
- Stubbs-Danielson v. Astrue, 539 F.3d 1169, 1174 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Morinskey v. Astrue, 458 F. App'x 640, 641 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Shaibi v. Berryhill, 883 F.3d 1102, 1107-08 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Ford v. Saul, 950 F.3d 1141, 1154 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Burch v. Barnhart, 400 F.3d 676, 679 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Saelee v. Chater, 94 F.3d 520, 522 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Albalos v. Sullivan, 907 F.2d 871, 873-74 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Morgan v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec. Admin., 169 F.3d 595, 599 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Bunnell v. Sullivan, 947 F.2d 341, 344-47 (9th Cir. 1991) (en banc)
- Smolen v. Chater, 80 F.3d 1273, 1284 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Wade v. Saul, 850 F. App'x 568, 569 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Molina v. Astrue, 674 F.3d 1104, 1112-13 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Ahearn v. Saul, 988 F.3d 1111, 1117 (9th Cir. 2021)

