

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
ARKANSAS, HARRISON DIVISION

Tammy M. Rocheleau v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner, Social
Security Administration

Rocheleau · No. Civil No. 25-3030 · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas reviewed the denial of Tammy M. Rocheleau’s claim for Social Security disability insurance benefits. The court held that substantial evidence supported the administrative law judge’s findings regarding the applicable Listings and Rocheleau’s residual functional capacity, summarily affirmed the decision, and dismissed the complaint with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Harrison Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Christy D. Comstock
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Harrison Division
DECIDED	November 24, 2025
DOCKET	Civil No. 25-3030
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of her Title II disability insurance benefits claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed whether the Commissioner's decision was supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole. Substantial evidence is less than a preponderance but sufficient for a reasonable mind to find the evidence adequate. The decision must be affirmed if substantial evidence supports it, even if the record also supports a contrary result.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum opinion from a federal district court

PARTIES

Tammy M. Rocheleau v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner, Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

disability definition

ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's residual functional capacity determination.
2. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's finding that Plaintiff could perform light work with specified environmental, mental, and social limitations.
3. Whether the ALJ properly considered the combined effects of Plaintiff's impairments.
4. Whether Plaintiff's impairments met or medically equaled a listed impairment.
5. Whether the ALJ erred in applying the relevant disability rules.

HOLDINGS

1. The Commissioner's denial of Title II disability insurance benefits was supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.
2. The ALJ's determination that Plaintiff could perform light work with specified limitations through her date last insured was supported by substantial evidence.
3. Plaintiff's impairments did not meet or medically equal the requirements of any applicable Listing through her date last insured.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"As long as there is substantial evidence in the record that supports the Commissioner's decision, the Court may not reverse it simply because substantial evidence exists in the record that would have supported a contrary outcome, or because the Court would have decided the case differently."

"Accordingly, the ALJ's decision is hereby summarily affirmed, and Plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed with prejudice."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged disability beginning May 2, 2019, based on atrial fibrillation, depression, chronic pain, fibromyalgia, gastrointestinal problems, knee problems, and hypertension. She remained insured for Title II benefits through September 30, 2021. The ALJ found severe impairments including hypertension, asthma, spinal disorders, atrial fibrillation, anxiety, and depression, but determined that the impairments did not meet or equal a listed impairment and that Plaintiff retained the capacity for limited light work.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff protectively filed for disability insurance benefits in July 2021. After a May 2024 administrative hearing, the ALJ denied benefits in a written decision dated June 11, 2024; the Appeals Council denied review on April 15, 2025. Plaintiff then filed this action, and the parties submitted appeal briefs to the district court pursuant to their consent.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Ramirez v. Barnhart, 292 F.3d 576, 583 (8th Cir. 2002)
- Edwards v. Barnhart, 314 F.3d 964, 966 (8th Cir. 2003)
- Haley v. Massanari, 258 F.3d 742, 747 (8th Cir. 2001)
- Young v. Apfel, 221 F.3d 1065, 1068 (8th Cir. 2000)
- Basinger v. Heckler, 725 F.2d 1166, 1168 (8th Cir. 1984)
- Cox v. Apfel, 160 F.3d 1203, 1206 (8th Cir. 1998)
- Perks v. Astrue, 687 F.3d 1086, 1092 (8th Cir. 2012)
- Sledge v. Astrue, No. 08-0089, 2008 WL 4816675 (W.D. Mo. Oct. 31, 2008), aff'd, 364 F. App'x 307 (8th Cir. 2010)