

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, TAMPA DIVISION

Rhonda T. Williams v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social
Security

Williams v. Bisignano · No. 8:24-cv-02814-AAS · Decided February 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida reviewed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of Rhonda T. Williams’s claim for disability insurance benefits. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge properly evaluated Williams’s subjective complaints and that substantial evidence supported the residual functional capacity determination, affirming the Commissioner’s decision and directing entry of judgment for the Commissioner.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Amanda Arnold Sansone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Tampa Division
DECIDED	February 2, 2026
DOCKET	8:24-cv-02814-AAS
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's denial of her claim for a period of disability and disability insurance benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court determines whether the ALJ applied the correct legal standards and whether substantial evidence supports the ALJ's findings. The court may not make new factual determinations, reweigh the evidence, or substitute its judgment for the Commissioner's; a decision must be affirmed if supported by substantial evidence and based on proper legal standards.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation and metadata identifying precedential status as Unknown.

PARTIES

Rhonda T. Williams v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

disability definition

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated Williams's subjective complaints and whether the residual functional capacity assessment adequately accounted for those complaints and the medical evidence before her date last insured.
2. Whether substantial evidence supported the Commissioner's determination that Williams was not disabled during the period ending June 30, 2022.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ properly evaluated Williams's subjective complaints because the ALJ considered the complaints in conjunction with the medical evidence, medical opinions, treatment history, noncompliance, and daily activities, and adequately explained why the complaints were not entirely consistent with the record.
2. The Commissioner's determination that Williams was not disabled through June 30, 2022, must be affirmed because the ALJ applied the proper legal standards and substantial evidence supported the findings.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“whatever the meaning of ‘substantial’ in other contexts, the threshold for such evidentiary sufficiency is not high.” (5)

“Even when the court finds the evidence could support a different conclusion, the ALJ’s decision must be affirmed if it is supported by substantial evidence and based on proper legal standards.” (11)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Williams alleged disability from chronic kidney disease, acute renal failure, diabetes mellitus, peripheral edema, and cardiac problems. During the insured period, the ALJ found severe impairments including chronic kidney disease, end-stage renal disease, hypertension, obesity, neuropathy, coronary artery disease, congestive heart failure, and diabetes mellitus, but determined that they did not meet or equal a listed impairment. The ALJ assessed a light-work residual functional capacity and found that Williams could perform her past work as a daycare center director and other jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy. Williams began

dialysis four months after her date last insured, but the court held that the relevant disability period for her DIB claim ended on June 30, 2022.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Williams applied for disability insurance benefits alleging disability beginning May 1, 2020. Her application was denied initially and on reconsideration; following a hearing, the ALJ issued an unfavorable decision on September 7, 2023, and the Appeals Council denied review on October 9, 2024. The district court reviewed the administrative record and affirmed the Commissioner's decision, directing the Clerk to enter judgment for the Commissioner and close the file.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- *McRoberts v. Bowen*, 841 F.2d 1077, 1080 (11th Cir. 1988)
- *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 390 (1971)
- *Dale v. Barnhart*, 395 F.3d 1206, 1210 (11th Cir. 2005)
- *Foote v. Chater*, 67 F.3d 1553, 1560 (11th Cir. 1995)
- *Biestek v. Berryhill*, 139 S. Ct. 1148, 1154 (2019)
- *Phillips v. Barnhart*, 357 F.3d 1232, 1240 & n.8 (11th Cir. 2004)
- *Lowery v. Sullivan*, 979 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1992)
- *Wilson v. Barnhart*, 284 F.3d 1219, 1225 (11th Cir. 2002)
- *Marbury v. Sullivan*, 957 F.2d 837, 839 (11th Cir. 1992)
- *Miraco B. v. Comm'r, Soc. Sec. Admin.*, No. 19-CV-05777, 2021 WL 9667338, at *12 (N.D. Ga. July 8, 2021)
- *Moore v. Barnhard*, 405 F.3d 1208, 1211 (11th Cir. 2005)
- *Keplar v. Saul*, No. 8:18-cv-1370, 2019 WL 4744941, at *6 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 30, 2019)
- *Macia v. Bowen*, 829 F.2d 1009, 1012 (11th Cir. 1987)
- *Laws v. Saul*, No. 8:19-cv-123-t-AAS, 2020 WL 13601696, at *7 (M.D. Fla. Apr. 27, 2020)
- *Hunter v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 808 F.3d 818, 822 (11th Cir. 2015)
- *Winschel v. Comm' of Soc. Sec.*, 631 F.3d 1176, 1178 (11th Cir. 2011)
- *Ted Martin v. Louis W. Sullivan, Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, Martin v. Sullivan*, 894 F.2d 1520, 1529 (11th Cir. 1990)