

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Stacey Savy Meas v. Commissioner of Social Security

Meas · No. 2:24-cv-01295 CKD · Decided August 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied Stacey Savy Meas’s motion for summary judgment and granted the Commissioner of Social Security’s cross-motion. The court upheld the administrative finding that Meas’s disability ended on October 21, 2021, concluding that substantial evidence supported the findings regarding medical improvement, subjective symptoms, residual functional capacity, and available work. The Clerk was directed to enter judgment for the Commissioner.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Carolyn K. Delaney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 21, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-01295 CKD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's final decision terminating her disability benefits. The parties consented to magistrate judge jurisdiction and filed cross-motions for summary judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed whether the Commissioner's decision applied proper legal standards and was supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole. The court upheld findings susceptible to more than one rational interpretation and deferred to the ALJ's credibility determinations when the proper process and sufficient reasons were used.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; no reporter citation or precedential designation appears in the source.
PARTIES	Stacey Savy Meas v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

summary judgment

administrative law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ reasonably found that plaintiff experienced medical improvement as of October 21, 2021.
2. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated and discounted plaintiff's subjective symptom testimony.
3. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity determination was supported by substantial evidence.
4. Whether the ALJ erred at step five by finding that plaintiff could perform jobs available in the national economy.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ reasonably found medical improvement because plaintiff no longer had the cervical-cancer impairment that had met the applicable listing at the comparison point decision, and the record showed that the cancer had been successfully treated without evidence of disease or recurrence.
2. The ALJ properly evaluated plaintiff's subjective symptom testimony because, absent evidence of malingering, the ALJ identified specific, clear, and convincing reasons supported by the record for finding that the alleged intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of the symptoms were not entirely consistent with the evidence.
3. The ALJ's residual functional capacity determination was supported by substantial evidence, and plaintiff did not demonstrate that the RFC failed to account for her alleged pain, need for an assistive device, memory problems, or pace limitations.
4. The ALJ did not err at step five because the step-five challenge depended on the alleged defects in the RFC determination, and those alleged defects were not established.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The court reviews the Commissioner's decision to determine whether (1) it is based on proper legal standards pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and (2) substantial evidence in the record as a whole supports it." (at 2)

"medical improvement is 'any decrease in the medical severity of your impairment(s) which was present at the time of the most recent favorable medical decision that [the claimant was disabled].'" (at 3)

"Without affirmative evidence showing that the claimant is malingering, the Commissioner's reasons for rejecting the claimant's testimony must be clear and convincing." (at 5)

"When discounting subjective testimony, an ALJ must provide 'specific, clear, and convincing reasons for doing so.'" (at 5)

“IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiffs motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 11) is DENIED; 2. The Commissioner’s cross-motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 15) is GRANTED; and 3. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment for the Commissioner.” (at 8)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was found disabled in 2018 based on invasive squamous cell carcinoma of the cervix. After treatment, medical records reflected no evidence of active disease or recurrence, and the Commissioner found medical improvement as of October 21, 2021. Plaintiff alleged continuing pelvic and whole-body pain, cognitive problems, depression, and difficulty walking and standing, but the ALJ found that the evidence supported a light-work residual functional capacity with mental and physical limitations. Relying on vocational-expert testimony, the ALJ found that plaintiff could perform a significant number of jobs in the national economy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff was found disabled beginning February 21, 2018 because of cervical cancer. Following a continuing disability review, the Commissioner determined that her disability ended on October 21, 2021; reconsideration upheld that determination, and an ALJ affirmed it after a May 23, 2023 hearing. Plaintiff challenged the ALJ's July 27, 2023 decision, and the district court denied plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, granted the Commissioner's cross-motion, and directed entry of judgment for the Commissioner.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Lambert v. Saul, 980 F.3d 1266, 1268 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Tackett v. Apfel, 180 F.3d 1094, 1097 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Edlund v. Massanari, 253 F.3d 1152, 1156 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Tommasetti v. Astrue, 533 F.3d 1035, 1038 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Howard v. Heckler, 782 F.2d 1484, 1487 (9th Cir. 1986)
- Jones v. Heckler, 760 F.2d 993, 995 (9th Cir. 1985)
- Hammock v. Bowen, 879 F.2d 498, 501 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Sprague v. Bowen, 812 F.2d 1226, 1229-30 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Burkhart v. Bowen, 856 F.2d 1335, 1338 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Saelee v. Chater, 94 F.3d 520, 522 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Albalos v. Sullivan, 907 F.2d 871, 873-74 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Morgan v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration, 169 F.3d 595, 599 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Bunnell v. Sullivan, 947 F.2d 341, 344-47 (9th Cir. 1991) (en banc)
- Smolen v. Chater, 80 F.3d 1273, 1284 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Wade v. Saul, 850 F. App'x 568, 569 (9th Cir. 2021)

- Valencia v. Heckler, 751 F.2d 1082, 1085 (9th Cir. 1985)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/stacey-savy-meas-v-commissioner-of-social-security-dzvoim80>