

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, CENTRAL DIVISION AT LEXINGTON

Stacy Thompson v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social
Security

Thompson · No. Civil Action No. 5:25-349-DCR · Decided June 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky affirmed the Social Security Administration’s denial of Stacy Thompson’s claims for disability insurance benefits and Supplemental Security Income. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge’s finding that Thompson lacked a medically determinable mental impairment, and the resulting residual functional capacity assessment, were supported by substantial evidence and applied the correct legal standards. Thompson’s motion for judgment was denied, the Commissioner’s motion was granted, and the action was dismissed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Central Division at Lexington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Danny C. Reeves
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Central Division at Lexington
DECIDED	June 1, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 5:25-349-DCR
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Judicial review of the Social Security Administration's final denial of Thompson's claims for disability insurance benefits and Supplemental Security Income. The parties filed competing motions for judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviews whether the Commissioner's findings are supported by substantial evidence and whether the Commissioner applied the proper legal standards. The court does not conduct de novo review, resolve conflicts in the evidence, or decide credibility questions.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court memorandum opinion with no published reporter citation identified in the source.
PARTIES	Stacy Thompson 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 violated applicable Social Security regulations by failing to adequately evaluate and explain the supportability and consistency of psychologist Meghan Shapiro's opinion concerning Thompson's mental restrictions.
2. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's conclusion that Thompson did not have a medically determinable mental impairment during the relevant period.
3. Whether the resulting residual functional capacity, which omitted mental restrictions, was supported by substantial evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ adequately considered the supportability and consistency of Shapiro's opinion and reasonably concluded that Thompson's opined mental limitations were not supported during the period of alleged disability.
2. The ALJ's conclusion that Thompson did not have a medically determinable mental impairment during the relevant period was supported by substantial evidence.
3. The Commissioner's decision was supported by substantial evidence and was not affected by reversible legal error.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A district court’s review is limited to determining whether the ALJ’s findings are supported by substantial evidence and whether the ALJ applied the proper legal standards in reaching his or her decision.” (Section II)

“Further, ALJ Eastham did not commit legal errors requiring reversal or remand for further administrative proceedings.” (Section IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Thompson sought DIB and SSI based principally on physical impairments and alleged mental limitations. The ALJ found severe physical impairments but concluded that Thompson did not have a medically determinable

mental impairment, relying in part on normal mental-status observations, the absence of mental-health treatment, and the more recent assessments of state psychological consultants. The ALJ formulated a light-work residual functional capacity without mental restrictions, found that Thompson could not perform past relevant work, and determined through vocational testimony that she could perform other jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Thompson filed claims for DIB and SSI in December 2022, alleging disability beginning in December 2021 and later amending the onset date to March 2022. After an administrative hearing, ALJ Jeffrey Eastham issued an unfavorable decision in October 2024. The Appeals Council denied review in July 2025, making the ALJ's decision final. Thompson sought review in the district court, which denied her motion, granted the Commissioner's motion, and dismissed the action.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Cruse v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 502 F.3d 532, 539 (6th Cir. 2007)
- *Combs v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 459 F.3d 640, 642 (6th Cir. 2006) (en banc)
- *White v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 312 F. App'x 779, 785 (6th Cir. 2009)
- *Her v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 203 F.3d 388, 391 (6th Cir. 1999)
- *Rogers v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 486 F.3d 234, 241 (6th Cir. 2007)
- *Ulman v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 693 F.3d 709, 713-14 (6th Cir. 2012)
- *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971)
- *Bass v. McMahon*, 499 F.3d 506, 509 (6th Cir. 2007)
- *Childers v. Kijakazi*, No. CV 5:21-285-JMH, 2022 WL 2706150, at *5 (E.D. Ky. July 12, 2022)
- *Miles v. Commissioner of Social Security*, 2021 WL 4905438, at *3 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 21, 2021)
- *Elizabeth A. v. Commissioner of Social Security*, No. 2:22-cv-2313, 2023 WL 5924414, at *4 (S.D. Ohio Sept. 12, 2023)
- *Marci M. v. Commissioner of Social Security*, No. 2:22-CV-12204, 2024 WL 1478185, at *12-13 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 29, 2024)
- *Marci A. M. v. Commissioner of Social Security*, No. 22-CV-12204, 2024 WL 1138032, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 15, 2024)
- *Blankenship v. Bowen*, 874 F.2d 1116, 1121 (6th Cir. 1989)
- *Mason v. Commissioner of Social Security*, No. 17-2407, 2018 WL 6133750, at *1 (6th Cir. Apr. 30, 2018)