

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION

Dana Renae Myers v. Frank Bisignano

Myers · No. 4:24-cv-01044-MAL · Decided May 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri reviewed the denial of Dana Renae Myers’s application for Social Security Disability Insurance benefits. The court held that substantial evidence supported the Administrative Law Judge’s residual functional capacity determination and evaluation of Myers’s impairments and subjective complaints, and affirmed the Commissioner’s final decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maria A. Lanahan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	May 19, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-cv-01044-MAL
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of the Acting Commissioner's final decision denying Plaintiff's application for Disability Insurance Benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews the Commissioner's decision to determine whether it is supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole and applies the correct legal standards. The court may not reverse merely because inconsistent conclusions could be drawn from the evidence or because it might have reached a different result.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum and order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Dana Renae Myers v. Frank Bisignano, Acting Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

disability definition

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

disability benefits

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity determination failed to account for Myers's joint and shoulder impairments.
2. Whether the ALJ adequately explained the treatment of medical evidence, including the decision to adopt some but not all limitations identified by state-agency medical consultants.
3. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated Myers's subjective complaints under Polaski and Social Security Ruling 16-3p.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ's RFC determination was supported by substantial evidence because the ALJ considered Myers's shoulder impairment and reasonably relied on mild imaging findings, generally normal examinations, treatment history, daily activities, and work activity.
2. The ALJ did not err by accepting some, but not all, of the state-agency consultants' findings.
3. The ALJ properly evaluated Myers's subjective complaints and reasonably found that the alleged intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of her symptoms were not entirely consistent with the medical and other evidence.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Substantial evidence is a term of art meaning only “such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.””

“If there is substantial evidence to support the decision, the Court may not reverse, even if inconsistent conclusions may be drawn from the evidence, and even if the Court may have reached a different outcome.”

“The ALJ’s brevity is not reversible error.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Myers filed for Disability Insurance Benefits alleging disability based on mental-health impairments, migraines, right shoulder and rotator-cuff problems, carpal tunnel syndrome, and cervical pain. The ALJ found severe joint, depressive, anxiety, and PTSD impairments but determined that Myers did not meet a listed impairment and retained the residual functional capacity for restricted light work with additional postural, environmental, and mental limitations. The record included mild AC-joint degeneration, some shoulder tenderness and reduced movement, generally normal strength and range-of-motion findings, treatment with medication, injections, and physical therapy, daily activities, and work activity during the relevant period.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Myers applied for Disability Insurance Benefits, and the application was denied initially and on reconsideration. After an administrative hearing, the ALJ found that Myers was not disabled because she could perform a restricted range of light work and could perform jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy. Myers sought review in federal district court, challenging the RFC determination and the evaluation of her subjective complaints. The court affirmed the Commissioner's final decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Pearsall v. Massanari, 274 F.3d 1211, 1217 (8th Cir. 2001)
- Medhaug v. Astrue, 578 F.3d 805, 813 (8th Cir. 2009)
- Kelley v. Callahan, 133 F.3d 583, 587–88 (8th Cir. 1998)
- Dunahoo v. Apfel, 241 F.3d 1033, 1039 (8th Cir. 2001)
- Strongson v. Barnhart, 361 F.3d 1066, 1069–70 (8th Cir. 2004)
- Biestek v. Berryhill, 587 U.S. 97, 103 (2019)
- Krogmeier v. Barnhart, 294 F.3d 1019, 1022 (8th Cir. 2002)
- McNamara v. Astrue, 590 F.3d 607, 610 (8th Cir. 2010)
- Hurd v. Astrue, 621 F.3d 734, 738 (8th Cir. 2010)
- Cox v. Astrue, 495 F.3d 614, 619 (8th Cir. 2007)
- Young v. Apfel, 221 F.3d 1065, 1069 n. 5 (8th Cir. 2000)
- Dykes v. Apfel, 223 F.3d 865, 867 (8th Cir. 2000)
- Austin v. Kijakazi, 52 F.4th 723, 729, 731 (8th Cir. 2022)
- Wildman v. Astrue, 596 F.3d 959, 966 (8th Cir. 2010)
- Grindley v. Kijakazi, 9 F.4th 622, 631 (8th Cir. 2021)
- Miles v. Harris, 645 F.2d 122, 124 (2d Cir. 1981)
- Davidson v. Astrue, 501 F.3d 987, 990 (8th Cir. 2007)
- Hilderbrand v. Berryhill, 2017 WL 2618269, at *23 (E.D. Mo. June 16, 2017)
- Nicolls v. Astrue, 874 F. Supp. 2d 785, 801–02 (N.D. Iowa 2012)
- Reed v. Saul, 481 F. Supp. 3d 877, 887 (D. Minn. 2020)
- Polaski v. Heckler, 739 F.2d 1320, 1322 (8th Cir. 1984)
- Buckner v. Astrue, 646 F.3d 549, 558 (8th Cir. 2011)
- Goff v. Barnhart, 421 F.3d 785, 791 (8th Cir. 2005)
- Casey v. Astrue, 503 F.3d 687, 695–96 (8th Cir. 2007)