

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION

David Hicks v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

No. 4:24-cv-01453-RWS (E.D. Mo. Jan. 6, 2026) · No. No. 4:24 CV 1453 RWS · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri reviews David Hicks’s claims challenging the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of disability insurance and supplemental security income benefits. The court concludes that the ALJ properly evaluated the medical opinions, subjective complaints, and residual functional capacity, and affirms the Commissioner’s decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	No. 4:24 CV 1453 RWS
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying applications for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income. Plaintiff requested reversal and an award of benefits or, alternatively, remand.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court must affirm if the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole. Substantial evidence is less than a preponderance but sufficient for a reasonable person to support the conclusion. The court must consider evidence supporting and detracting from the decision but may not reverse merely because substantial evidence could support a contrary outcome.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	David Hicks v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- disability definition
- ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

disability benefits

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the supportability and consistency of the state-agency medical consultants' opinions under 20 C.F.R. §§ 404.1520c and 416.920c.
2. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated Hicks's subjective complaints of pain and physical and mental limitations.
3. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity determination was supported by substantial evidence.
4. Whether the ALJ was required to obtain additional medical-source evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ properly articulated and evaluated the supportability and consistency of the state-agency consultants' opinions and permissibly found those opinions persuasive.
2. The ALJ properly evaluated Hicks's subjective complaints and permissibly found them inconsistent in part with the record as a whole.
3. The ALJ's determination that Hicks could perform a reduced range of light work was supported by substantial evidence.
4. The ALJ was not required to obtain additional medical-source evidence because the existing record provided a sufficient basis for the decision.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[Substantial evidence] means – and means only – such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” (Discussion § A)

“The ALJ was not required to obtain additional medical source evidence.” (Discussion § C)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

David Hicks alleged disability beginning September 1, 2019, based on physical impairments including shoulder and cervical-spine conditions, lumbar radiculopathy, bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome, a prior ankle fracture, and asthma, as well as bipolar disorder, depression, anxiety, and ADHD. He had previously worked as a laborer, cashier or assistant manager, and dishwasher, and underwent left shoulder labral repair and bilateral carpal-tunnel procedures. The ALJ found that Hicks retained the capacity for a reduced range of light work with postural, environmental, upper-extremity, and mental limitations and identified jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hicks's applications were denied initially and on reconsideration. After a hearing, the Administrative Law Judge found that Hicks was not disabled and could perform a reduced range of light, unskilled work. The Appeals

Council denied review on September 17, 2024, making the ALJ's decision the Commissioner's final decision. The district court affirmed the Commissioner's decision and entered judgment.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Pearsall v. Massanari, 274 F.3d 1211 (8th Cir. 2001)
- Baker v. Secretary of Health & Human Services, 955 F.2d 552 (8th Cir. 1992)
- Bowen v. Yuckert, 482 U.S. 137 (1987)
- Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389 (1971)
- Estes v. Barnhart, 275 F.3d 722 (8th Cir. 2002)
- Johnson v. Apfel, 240 F.3d 1145 (8th Cir. 2001)
- Biestek v. Berryhill, 139 S. Ct. 1148 (2019)
- Coleman v. Astrue, 498 F.3d 767 (8th Cir. 2007)
- McNamara v. Astrue, 590 F.3d 607 (8th Cir. 2010)
- Anderson v. Astrue, 696 F.3d 790 (8th Cir. 2012)
- Basinger v. Heckler, 725 F.2d 1166 (8th Cir. 1984)
- Wilma J. Battles v. Louis Sullivan, Battles v. Sullivan, 902 F.2d 657 (8th Cir. 1990)
- Polaski v. Heckler, 739 F.2d 1320 (8th Cir. 1984)
- Casey v. Astrue, 503 F.3d 687 (8th Cir. 2007)
- Hildebrand v. Barnhart, 302 F.3d 836 (8th Cir. 2002)
- H.D. by Maslo v. Kijakazi, No. 4:20-CV-01532-SRC, 2022 WL 2904143 (E.D. Mo. July 22, 2022)
- Starman v. Kijakazi, No. 2:20-CV-00035-SRC, 2021 WL 4459729 (E.D. Mo. Sept. 29, 2021)
- Black v. Apfel, 143 F.3d 383 (8th Cir. 1998)
- Whitney v. Astrue, 668 F.3d 1004 (8th Cir. 2012)
- Lucas v. Saul, No. 2:18 CV 45 CDP (E.D. Mo. Sept. 5, 2019)
- White v. O'Malley, No. 4:23-CV-539-ACL, 2024 WL 4202686 (E.D. Mo. Sept. 16, 2024)
- Lowe v. Apfel, 226 F.3d 969 (8th Cir. 2000)
- Anderson v. Shalala, 51 F.3d 777 (8th Cir. 1995)