

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

Tanya A. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of the Social Security
Administration

Tanya A. · No. 1:24-cv-02975 · Decided March 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois reviewed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of Tanya A.’s application for supplemental security income under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The court held that the administrative law judge’s step-three Listings analysis and residual functional capacity determination were supported by substantial evidence and free of reversible error. Plaintiff’s motion to reverse was denied, and the Commissioner’s request to affirm was granted.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Beth W. Jantz
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 24, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-02975
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking review of the Commissioner's final decision denying supplemental security income benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews whether the Commissioner's final decision is supported by substantial evidence and free of legal error. The court may not reweigh evidence, resolve evidentiary conflicts, determine credibility, or substitute its judgment for the ALJ's judgment when substantial evidence supports the decision.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court memorandum opinion; persuasive value only

PARTIES

Tanya A. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

agency adjudication

administrative law

disability definition

ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability benefits

administrative law

federal judicial review

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly determined that Tanya's impairments did not meet or medically equal Listings 12.04 and 12.06.
2. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity assessment was supported by substantial evidence, including the treatment of Dr. Lopez's five-pound lifting restriction, Tanya's pain complaints, and her discontinuation of Depakote.
3. Whether the ALJ improperly failed to include Dr. Lopez's five-pound lifting restriction in the hypothetical questions posed to the vocational expert.
4. Whether the ALJ's Step 5 finding that Tanya could perform other work in the national economy was supported by substantial evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ's Step 3 determination was supported by substantial evidence. Tanya did not establish reversible error in the findings that she failed to satisfy the Paragraph B or Paragraph C criteria of Listings 12.04 and 12.06; the court therefore did not need to resolve whether she satisfied the Paragraph A criteria of Listing 12.06.
2. The ALJ's RFC assessment was supported by substantial evidence and did not contain reversible error.
3. The ALJ adequately considered Tanya's pain complaints and reasonably found that her statements concerning the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of her symptoms were not entirely consistent with the medical and other evidence.
4. The ALJ did not err by omitting the five-pound restriction because hypotheticals to the vocational expert need include only limitations that the ALJ accepts as credible and supported by the medical record.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Court's scope of review is limited to deciding whether the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is based upon substantial evidence." (R. 4)

"Substantial evidence "means—and means only—such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."" (R. 4)

“The claimant has been prescribed psychiatric medications and underwent counseling visits during the period in consideration.” (R. 24)

“Thus, for all of the reasons above, Tanya fails to show any reversible error in the ALJ’s RFC determination.” (R. 30)

“For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff’s Motion to Reverse the Final Decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (Dkt. 17) is DENIED, and the Commissioner’s request to affirm (Dkt. 23 at 1) is GRANTED.” (R. 31)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Tanya A. alleged disability based principally on physical impairments and mental impairments including bipolar disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder. The ALJ found severe impairments but determined that they did not meet or medically equal Listings 12.04, 12.06, 12.15, or the applicable physical listing. The ALJ assessed a residual functional capacity for light work with physical, mental, and social limitations, and found that although Tanya could not perform past relevant work, she could perform jobs such as marker, folder, and classifier that existed in significant numbers in the national economy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Tanya A. applied for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income, later amending her alleged onset date so that only the SSI claim remained. The Social Security Administration denied the claim initially and on reconsideration. After an administrative hearing, the ALJ denied benefits, and the Appeals Council denied review, making the ALJ’s decision the Commissioner’s final decision. The district court denied the plaintiff’s motion to reverse, granted the Commissioner’s request to affirm, and affirmed the Commissioner’s decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Haynes v. Barnhart, 416 F.3d 621, 626 (7th Cir. 2005)
- Warnell v. O’Malley, 97 F.4th 1050, 1052-53 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Biestek v. Berryhill, 587 U.S. 97, 102 (2019)
- Scroggins v. Colvin, 765 F.3d 685, 695 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Gedatus v. Saul, 994 F.3d 893, 900-03 (7th Cir. 2021)
- Lopez ex rel. Lopez v. Barnhart, 336 F.3d 535, 539 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Wilder v. Kijakazi, 22 F.4th 644, 651, 653 (7th Cir. 2022)
- Garza v. Kijakazi, No. 21-2164, 2022 WL 378663, at *2 (7th Cir. Feb. 8, 2022)
- Richardson v. Kijakazi, No. 22-2746, 2023 WL 4103000, at *2 (7th Cir. June 21, 2023)
- Sheralyn B. v. Kijakazi, No. 22-cv-50280, 2023 WL 6290588, at *3 n.5 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 27, 2023)
- Mark H. v. Kijakazi, No. 20-cv-07726, 2022 WL 4329114, at *9 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 19, 2022)
- Filus v. Astrue, 694 F.3d 863, 867 (7th Cir. 2012)

- Thea P. v. Saul, No. 18-cv-08058, 2020 WL 2614853, at *7-9 (N.D. Ill. May 22, 2020)
- Julie S. v. O'Malley, No. 21-cv-04816, 2024 WL 1092683, at *3-9 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 13, 2024)
- Combs v. Kijakazi, 69 F.4th 428, 435 (7th Cir. 2023)
- Jones v. Astrue, 623 F.3d 1155, 1162 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Marco C. v. Colvin, No. 22-cv-00765, 2025 WL 263574, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 22, 2025)
- Manuel C. v. O'Malley, No. 20-cv-05525, 2024 WL 916226, at *11 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 4, 2024)
- Jeske v. Saul, 955 F.3d 583, 590 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Zellweger v. Saul, 984 F.3d 1251, 1254-55 (7th Cir. 2021)
- Curvin v. Colvin, 778 F.3d 645, 650 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Victoria R. v. Kijakazi, No. 20-cv-04444, 2022 WL 3543231, at *12 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 18, 2022)
- Jason V. v. Kijakazi, No. 20-cv-04992, 2023 WL 5289369, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 17, 2023)
- Vuletich v. Bisignano, No. 23-3013, 2025 WL 1743502 (7th Cir. June 24, 2025)
- Minnick v. Colvin, 775 F.3d 929, 936 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Brindisi v. Barnhard, 315 F.3d 783, 786 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Lowe v. Saul, No. 18-cv-00428, 2020 WL 439413, at *4 (N.D. Ind. Jan. 9, 2020)
- Carrie K. v. O'Malley, No. 23-cv-00769, 2024 WL 3581906, at *4-5 (N.D. Ill. July 30, 2024)
- Acera B. v. Saul, No. 20-cv-01674, 2021 WL 2222605, at *5 (N.D. Ill. June 2, 2021)
- Heuschmidt v. Colvin, No. 14-cv-04377, 2015 WL 7710368, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 30, 2015)
- Bruno v. Saul, 817 F. App'x 238, 241 (7th Cir. 2020)
- 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520c(c)(1)-(5)
- Michelle D. v. Kijakazi, No. 21 C 1561, 2022 WL 972280, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022)
- Pavlicek v. Saul, 994 F.3d 777, 781 (7th Cir. 2021)
- Henderson v. Kijakazi, No. 22-cv-03890, 2023 WL 6388143, at *7 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 29, 2023)
- Beardsley v. Colvin, 758 F.3d 834, 836-37, 839 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Clifford v. Apfel, 227 F.3d 863, 870 (7th Cir. 2000)
- Burmester v. Berryhill, 920 F.3d 507, 510 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Wilson v. Berryhill, 737 F. App'x 286, 290 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Dixon v. Massanari, 270 F.3d 1171, 1178 (7th Cir. 2001)
- Grotts v. Kijakazi, 27 F.4th 1273, 1278-79 (7th Cir. 2022)
- Reinaas v. Saul, 953 F.3d 461, 467 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Pufahl v. Bisignano, 142 F.4th 446, 458-59 (7th Cir. 2025)
- I.H. v. Colvin, No. 12-cv-09173, 2014 WL 114173, at *11 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 10, 2014)
- Butler v. Kijakazi, 4 F.4th 498, 501 (7th Cir. 2021)
- French v. Colvin, No. 14-cv-10240, 2016 WL 4798924, at *8 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 14, 2016)
- Steele v. Barnhart, 290 F.3d 936, 942 (7th Cir. 2002)
- Schmidt v. Astrue, 496 F.3d 833, 846 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Best v. Berryhill, 730 F. App'x 380, 382 (7th Cir. 2018)

- Deborah H. v. Kijakazi, No. 21-cv-01195, 2023 WL 2743549, at *9 n.6 (S.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2023)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-il/2026/tanya-a-v-frank-bisignano-commissioner-of-the-social-7nhbry40>