

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Alijah J. B. v. Commissioner, Social Security Administration

No. 3:24-cv-01527-MC (D. Or. Feb. 20, 2026) · No. 3:24-cv-01527-MC · Decided February 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of the plaintiff’s applications for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge properly evaluated the plaintiff’s subjective symptom testimony and supported the residual functional capacity determination with substantial evidence.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael J. McShane
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	February 20, 2026
DOCKET	3:24-cv-01527-MC
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action for judicial review under 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) of the Commissioner's final decision denying Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews whether the Commissioner's decision applied proper legal standards and is supported by substantial evidence, reviewing the administrative record as a whole and considering evidence that both supports and detracts from the ALJ's conclusion. The court may not substitute its judgment for the Commissioner's when the evidence reasonably supports either affirming or reversing.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Alijah J. B. v. Commissioner, Social Security Administration

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- agency adjudication

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ provided legally sufficient reasons for discounting Plaintiff's subjective symptom testimony concerning his ability to understand written instructions.
2. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity assessment was supported by substantial evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ properly discounted Plaintiff's testimony concerning more severe limitations in understanding instructions because the testimony was inconsistent with the objective medical evidence and the medical opinions addressing his intellectual functioning.
2. The RFC assessment was supported by substantial evidence and did not require reversal because the ALJ reasonably translated the supported moderate cognitive limitations into restrictions to simple, routine, and repetitive tasks, along with the stated environmental and social restrictions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“ “[T]he ALJ can reject the claimant’s testimony about the severity of [their] symptoms only by offering specific, clear and convincing reasons for doing so.” ” (Discussion)

“The ALJ’s path is more than reasonably discernable here, and the Court may not substitute its judgment for that of the ALJ.” (Discussion)

“The ALJ’s decision is free of legal error and supported by substantial evidence. The Commissioner’s decision is **AFFIRMED**.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged disability beginning December 24, 2019, based on asthma, ADHD, cannabis use disorder, anxiety, depression, obesity, and borderline intellectual functioning. The ALJ found that Plaintiff had severe impairments but retained the residual functional capacity for medium work with environmental, social, and cognitive restrictions, including simple, routine, and repetitive tasks. Plaintiff challenged the ALJ's treatment of his subjective testimony concerning his ability to understand written instructions. The district court concluded that the ALJ reasonably accounted for the supported moderate limitation in understanding, remembering, or applying information and that the decision was supported by substantial evidence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff applied for DIB and SSI, and the Social Security Administration denied the claims initially and on reconsideration. After a February 14, 2024 hearing, the ALJ denied the claims in a March 1, 2024 written decision. The Appeals Council denied review on July 24, 2024, making the ALJ's decision final. The district court affirmed the Commissioner's decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Batson v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration, 359 F.3d 1190, 1193 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Ahearn v. Saul, 988 F.3d 1111, 1115 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Hill v. Astrue, 698 F.3d 1153, 1159 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Sandgathe v. Chater, 108 F.3d 978, 980 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Davis v. Heckler, 868 F.2d 323, 326 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Martinez v. Heckler, 807 F.2d 771, 772 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Gutierrez v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration, 740 F.3d 519, 523 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Reddick v. Chater, 157 F.3d 715, 720-22 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Bustamante v. Massanari, 262 F.3d 949, 953-54 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Tackett v. Apfel, 180 F.3d 1094, 1098 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Garrison v. Colvin, 759 F.3d 995, 1014-15 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Lester v. Chater, 81 F.3d 821, 834 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Lambert v. Saul, 980 F.3d 1266, 1277 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Brown-Hunter v. Colvin, 806 F.3d 487, 492, 494-95 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Treichler v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration, 775 F.3d 1090, 1099 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Molina v. Astrue, 674 F.3d 1104, 1121 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Smartt v. Kijakazi, 53 F.4th 489, 498-99 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Stubbs-Danielson v. Astrue, 539 F.3d 1169, 1174 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Kalaisha B. v. Bisignano, 2025 WL 3555600, at *3 (D. Nev. Nov. 17, 2025)
- Young v. Saul, 845 F. App'x 518, 519-20 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Burrell v. Colvin, 775 F.3d 1133, 1138 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Kitchen v. Kijakazi, 82 F.4th 732, 738 (9th Cir. 2023)