

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

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