

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
NORTH CAROLINA

Bradley N.A. v. Bisignano

No. 1:25CV21 (M.D.N.C. Feb. 26, 2026) · No. 1:25CV21 · Decided February 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denied Bradley N.A.'s request for remand in an action seeking review of the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of disability insurance benefits. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge applied the correct disability-evaluation process, supported the residual functional capacity determination with substantial evidence, and adequately explained the finding that Bradley would be off task no more than five percent of the workday.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina
DECIDED	February 26, 2026
DOCKET	1:25CV21
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying Social Security disability insurance benefits and a period of disability.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews whether the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence and based on the correct application of the law. The court does not reweigh conflicting evidence, make credibility determinations, or substitute its judgment for the Commissioner's.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Bradley N.A. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

agency adjudication

administrative law

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ adequately explained the residual functional capacity finding that Bradley could understand, remember, and carry out instructions for 95 to 100 percent of an eight-hour workday.
2. Whether the ALJ's numerical finding that Bradley would be off task for no more than five percent of the workday lacked a sufficient evidentiary and logical basis.
3. Whether the ALJ's evaluation of Bradley's mental and physical limitations was supported by substantial evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ adequately explained the RFC finding that Bradley could understand, remember, and carry out instructions for at least 95 percent of an eight-hour workday by connecting the finding to medical opinions, treatment history, mental-status examinations, and Bradley's daily activities.
2. The Fourth Circuit's law does not categorically prohibit an ALJ from expressing a qualitative concentration, persistence, or pace limitation as a numerical percentage of the workday, and the ALJ's five-percent off-task finding was adequately supported here.
3. The Commissioner's decision was legally correct and supported by substantial evidence.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the issue before the Court is not whether Bradley is disabled but whether the finding that he is not disabled is supported by substantial evidence and based upon a correct application of the relevant law.” (at 2)

“The RFC measures the most a claimant can do in a work setting despite the physical and mental limitations of his or her impairments and any related symptoms (e.g., pain).” (at 3)

“The ALJ ‘must build an accurate and logical bridge from the evidence to [the] conclusion.’” (at 4)

“No more is required.” (at 12)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bradley alleged disability from insulin-dependent type I diabetes, major depressive disorder, and generalized anxiety disorder beginning April 15, 2021. The ALJ found that he had not engaged in substantial gainful activity, had severe impairments, and retained the residual functional capacity for a reduced range of light work, including simple tasks and being off task no more than five percent of the workday. The administrative record showed generally stable symptoms with treatment, largely unremarkable mental-status findings, and daily activities including driving, shopping, household chores, playing bass guitar in a band, and spending time with family and friends.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Bradley applied for disability insurance benefits and a period of disability in July 2021, alleging disability beginning April 15, 2021. The application was denied initially and on reconsideration. After a hearing, an ALJ found Bradley not disabled on November 8, 2023, and the Appeals Council denied review, making the ALJ's

decision the Commissioner's final decision. The district court reviewed the administrative record and briefing and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- *Hancock v. Astrue*, 667 F.3d 470, 472-73 (4th Cir. 2012)
- *Hines v. Barnhart*, 453 F.3d 559, 561-62 (4th Cir. 2006)
- *Smith v. Schweiker*, 795 F.2d 343, 345 (4th Cir. 1986)
- *Hunter v. Sullivan*, 993 F.2d 31, 34-35 (4th Cir. 1992)
- *Hays v. Sullivan*, 907 F.2d 1453, 1456 (4th Cir. 1990)
- *Craig v. Chater*, 76 F.3d 585, 589, 594-96 (4th Cir. 1996)
- *Albright v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration*, 174 F.3d 473, 475 n.2 (4th Cir. 1999)
- *Dunn v. Colvin*, 607 F. App'x 264, 266, 272 (4th Cir. 2015)
- *Hall v. Harris*, 658 F.2d 260, 265 (4th Cir. 1981)
- *Monroe v. Colvin*, 826 F.3d 176, 189, 191 (4th Cir. 2016)
- *Reid v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 769 F.3d 861, 865 (4th Cir. 2014)
- *Brown v. Commissioner*, 873 F.3d 251, 269 (4th Cir. 2017)
- *Thomas v. Berryhill*, 916 F.3d 307, 311 (4th Cir. 2019)
- *Ladda v. Berryhill*, 749 F. App'x 166, 170 (4th Cir. 2018)
- *Shively v. Heckler*, 739 F.2d 987, 989 (4th Cir. 1984)
- *England v. Commissioner of Social Security*, No. 15-12818, 2016 WL 8114219, at *14-15 (E.D. Mich. July 11, 2016)
- *Rebecca J. v. Kijakazi*, No. 22-1531, 2023 WL 3970022, at *3 (4th Cir. June 13, 2023)
- *Jordan v. Social Security Administration*, No. 2 CV 17-CV-03032-JMC, 2018 WL 4354196, at *3 (D. Md. Sept. 12, 2018)
- *Grayson O Co. v. Agadir International LLC*, 856 F.3d 307, 316 (4th Cir. 2017)
- *Brown v. Nucor Corp.*, 785 F.3d 895, 923 (4th Cir. 2015)
- *Medina v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 831 F. App'x 35, 36 (2d Cir. 2020)
- *Stitely v. Colvin*, No. 14-2302, 2015 WL 4621292, at *1 (4th Cir. Aug. 4, 2015)
- *Welch v. Saul*, No. 1:19-CV-189-DCK, 2020 WL 4586882, at *8 (W.D.N.C. Aug. 10, 2020)
- *Joseph D. W. v. O'Malley*, No. 1:23-cv-863, 2024 WL 3822724, at *6 (M.D.N.C. Aug. 14, 2024)
- *April A. J. v. Bisignano*, No. 1:24CV672, 2025 WL 2784211, at *4-7 (M.D.N.C. Sept. 30, 2025)
- *Dana D. v. Kijakazi*, No. 1:20CV673, Slip Op. at 14-15 (M.D.N.C. Oct. 26, 2021)
- *Megan M. v. Berryhill*, No. 17cv1125, Slip Op. at 16-20 (M.D.N.C. Dec. 13, 2018)

- Horner v. Acting Commissioner of Social Security Administration, No. 9:17-CV-00894-RBH, 2018 WL 4203675, at *7 (D.S.C. Sept. 4, 2018), aff'd sub nom. Horner v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration, 809 F. App'x 165 (4th Cir. 2020)
- Link v. Saul, No. 1:19CV662, 2020 WL 5044038, at *9 (M.D.N.C. Aug. 26, 2020)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-middle-district-of-north-carolina-united-states-district-court/2026/bradley-n-a-v-bisignano-erkgnwlc>