

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, LONDON DIVISION

Rebecca Lynn Stacy v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of SSA

Civil Action No. 6:25-22-KKC (E.D. Ky. Mar. 24, 2026) · No. 6:25-22-KKC · Decided March 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision denying Rebecca Lynn Stacy’s claim for disability benefits for the period from July 1, 2017, through June 12, 2022. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge adequately evaluated the supportability and consistency of Dr. Cristi Hundley’s opinion and the state agency medical opinions, and that the residual functional capacity determination was supported by substantial evidence.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, London Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karen K. Caldwell
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, London Division
DECIDED	March 24, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-22-KKC
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's decision denying Stacy's claim for Supplemental Security Income and Disability Insurance benefits for the period July 1, 2017, through June 12, 2022.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews whether the ALJ's decision is supported by substantial evidence and was made pursuant to proper legal standards. The court may not reverse merely because substantial evidence supports a different conclusion, and must affirm if substantial evidence supports the ALJ's decision even if the court would have reached a different conclusion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion; precedential status unknown

PARTIES

Rebecca Lynn Stacy v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of SSA

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

agency adjudication

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

federal judicial review

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ adequately evaluated the supportability and consistency of Dr. Cristi Hundley's medical opinion under the Social Security regulations.
2. Whether the ALJ adequately evaluated the supportability and consistency of the state-agency medical opinions.
3. Whether the ALJ complied with the Appeals Council's remand directives concerning consideration of medical opinions and the residual functional capacity.
4. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's finding that Stacy was not disabled from July 1, 2017, through June 12, 2022.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ adequately considered the supportability and consistency of Dr. Hundley's opinion, including the opinions that Stacy had marked limitations in workplace interaction and handling typical work-related stress.
2. The ALJ adequately evaluated the state-agency opinions and was not required to articulate how he considered every individual finding from those medical sources.
3. The ALJ complied with the Appeals Council's directives to reconsider the medical-source opinions and the maximum residual functional capacity and to provide supporting rationale with references to the record.
4. The ALJ's determination that Stacy was not disabled from July 1, 2017, through June 12, 2022, was supported by substantial evidence and applied proper legal standards.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court cannot find that the ALJ failed to adequately consider supportability or consistency in assessing Dr. Hundley’s opinion.” (AR 4837)

“For all these reasons, the Court hereby ORDERS that Plaintiff Rebecca Stacy’s request that the Court find her disabled during the Relevant Period or, alternatively, vacate the ALJ’s decision and remand this matter to the agency for further proceedings (R. 14) is DENIED. The Court will enter judgment affirming the Commissioner’s decision.” (AR 4839-40)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Stacy sought Supplemental Security Income and Disability Insurance benefits for the period from July 1, 2017, through June 12, 2022. During that period, the ALJ found severe physical and mental impairments, including PTSD, anxiety, and depression, but determined that Stacy retained the residual functional capacity for light work with restrictions to simple tasks, occasional interaction, and occasional gradually introduced changes. The ALJ discounted portions of psychologist Cristi Hundley's opinion finding marked limitations in workplace interaction and handling work-related stress, relying on Hundley's observations, other medical opinions, the treatment record, and Stacy's largely independent lifestyle.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

An ALJ initially found Stacy disabled beginning June 13, 2022, but found her not disabled for the earlier period. The Appeals Council vacated the unfavorable portion of that decision and remanded for further consideration. On remand, ALJ Todd Spangler again found Stacy not disabled during the relevant period. The district court denied Stacy's request for disability benefits or a remand and affirmed the Commissioner's decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Rabbers v. Commissioner of Social Security, 582 F.3d 647, 651 (6th Cir. 2009)
- Buxton v. Halter, Commissioner of Social Security, 246 F.3d 762, 772 (6th Cir. 2001)
- Elkins v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 658 F.2d 437, 439 (6th Cir. 1981)
- Walters v. Commissioner of Social Security, 127 F.3d 525, 529 (6th Cir. 1997)
- Tester-Kopec v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 1:25-CV-00001, 2025 WL 3628110, at *5 (N.D. Ohio Dec. 15, 2025)
- Hall v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 6:24-CV-63-KKC, 2025 WL 1409494, at *4 (E.D. Ky. May 15, 2025)
- Dyson v. Commissioner of Social Security, 786 F. App'x 586, 589 (6th Cir. 2019)
- Jordan v. Commissioner of Social Security, 548 F.3d 417, 423 (6th Cir. 2008)