

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Kuldip Singh v. Commissioner of Social Security

Singh · No. 1:24-cv-00533 · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s Findings and Recommendations in full. The court denied Kuldip Singh’s motion for summary judgment, affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of supplemental security income, directed entry of judgment for the Commissioner, and closed the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00533
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying supplemental security income. The district court reviewed the magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendations de novo after Plaintiff filed objections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendations under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); substantial-evidence review of the Commissioner's decision.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Kuldip Singh v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- summary judgment
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security
- administrative law
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ complied with the prior stipulated remand order and the law-of-the-case and rule-of-the-mandate doctrines.
2. Whether the ALJ properly considered and explained the rejection of Dr. Alam's medical opinion.
3. Whether substantial evidence supported the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ complied with the prior stipulated remand order by reevaluating the medical evidence, including the relevant medical-source opinion evidence; neither the Appeals Council nor the ALJ violated the law of the case or the rule of the mandate.
2. The ALJ properly considered the medical records and multiple medical opinions, found the record contradicted Dr. Alam's assessment, and explained the reasons for that finding.
3. The Commissioner's decision was supported by substantial evidence, and the denial of supplemental security income was affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In short, more than a “scintilla of evidence” supports the ALJ’s decision, which is all the “substantial evidence” standard demands.” (at 2)

“Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 18) and his appeal from the administrative decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is DENIED and the agency’s determination to deny benefits is AFFIRMED.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Kuldip Singh sought supplemental security income under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. The ALJ reevaluated the medical evidence after a stipulated remand order, including the opinions of treating physician Dr. Naveen Alam. The ALJ found that the record contradicted Dr. Alam's assessment and explained the basis for the decision.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Singh applied for supplemental security income under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. After a prior stipulated remand in Case No. 1:20-cv-01798 SAB, the Appeals Council directed the ALJ to reevaluate the medical evidence, including medical-source opinion evidence. The magistrate judge recommended denying Singh's motion for summary judgment, affirming the agency's decision, and entering judgment for the Commissioner. The district court overruled Singh's objections, adopted the Findings and Recommendations in full, affirmed the denial of benefits, and directed entry of judgment for the Commissioner.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389, 402 (1971)
- Martinez v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec., No. 1:20-cv-00728 CDB, 2024 WL 2786748, at *15 (E.D. Cal. May 30, 2024)

OPINION

Kuldip Singh v. Commissioner of Social Security
PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 KULDIP SINGH, Case No. 1:24-cv-00533 JLT BAM 12 Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING
FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING

13 v. PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT

14 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL

SECURITY, (Doc. 18) 15 Defendant. 16 17 18 Kuldip Singh seeks judicial review of a final
decision of the Commissioner of Social 19 Security denying his application for supplemental
security income under Title XVI of the Social 20 Security Act. (Doc. 1.) The assigned magistrate
judge issued Findings and Recommendations 21 and recommends denying Plaintiff’s Motion for
Summary Judgment, affirming the agency’s 22 decision to deny benefits, and entering judgment in
favor of the Commissioner. 1 (Doc. 26.) 23 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations
on all parties and notified them that 24 any objections were due within fourteen days. (Id.)
Plaintiff filed objections; Defendant did not. 25 (Doc. 27.) The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s
objections and has performed a de novo review 26 27 1 The Findings and Recommendations
occasionally employ the language of a dispositive or final order, such as the concluding statement
that the “Court upholds the AJL’s decision.” (Doc. 26 28 at 19.) The Court construes these
statements as recommendations, not orders, given their context. 1 under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c).
Following this review, the Court concludes the Findings and 2 Recommendations are supported by
the record and proper analysis, and the Court adopts them in 3 full; however, the Court addresses
two of Plaintiff’s objections briefly below in the interest of 4 creating a clear and complete record.
5 First, contrary to Plaintiff’s objections, and as the magistrate judge correctly summarized 6 in the
Findings and Recommendations, the Administrative Law Judge’s (ALJ’s) decision 7 complied
with the terms of the stipulated remand order issued by the District Court in Case
8 No. 1:20-cv-01798 SAB. (Doc. 15-2 at 957–63; Doc. 26 at 2–3, 9–10.) The parties had
9 stipulated before the District Court in that prior case—and the Court had accordingly ordered—
10 the Appeals Council to instruct the ALJ in turn to “reevaluate the medical evidence, including,

11 but not limited to, all the medical-source opinion evidence.” (Doc. 15-2 at 963.) The ALJ did
so, 12 including the opinion evidence of Dr. Naveen Alam, MD,2 a treating physician, as the
Appeals 13 Council also specifically instructed. (Doc. 15-2 at 873–87, 967–68; Doc. 26 at 3–8.)
This record 14 thus shows neither the Appeals Council nor the ALJ violated the law of the case,
the rule of the 15 mandate, or the general principles motivating those two doctrines. 16 Second,
the ALJ considered Plaintiff’s medical records, including multiple medical 17 opinions, found the
record contradicted Dr. Alam’s assessment, and explained why, again 18 contrary to Plaintiff’s
objections. (Doc. 26 at 12–15; Doc. 15-2 at 879–84.) In short, more than a 19 “scintilla of
evidence” supports the ALJ’s decision, which is all the “substantial evidence” 20 standard
demands. *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 402 (1971). This case is thus unlike 21 others in
which ALJs have wrongly rejected the opinions of treating physicians summarily, 22 including
those Plaintiff cites. Cf., e.g., *Martinez v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 1:20-cv-00728 23 CDB, 2024
WL 2786748, at *15 (E.D. Cal. May 30, 2024) (holding ALJ’s conclusory assertion 24 of
“inconsistency” fell short of the relevant standard). 25 The Court otherwise overrules Plaintiff’s
objections without further explanation. For 26 2 Plaintiff contends the opinions of two doctors are
actually at issue. (Doc. 27 at 2 n.2.) The 27 record contradicts that contention, as the Magistrate
Judge explained. (Doc. 26 at 10 n.3; Doc. 15-2 at 854.) In short, although the reports in question
are stamped with the address of a joint 28 medical practice, they bear the signature of Dr. Alam
only. (Doc. 15-2 at 859, 862.) 1 | these reasons, the Court thus ORDERS: 2 1. The Findings and
Recommendations issued on September 23, 2025 (Doc. 26) are 3 ADOPTED IN FULL. 4 2.
Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 18) and his appeal from the 5 administrative
decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is DENIED and the 6 agency’s determination to
deny benefits is AFFIRMED. 7 3. The Clerk of this Court is directed to enter judgment in favor of
the Commissioner of 8 Social Security and against Plaintiff Kuldip Singh and to close this case. 9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 11 Dated: _ January 8, 2026 Cerin | Tower
TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28