

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Asis R. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

Asis R. · No. 2:25-CV-00215-RLP · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of supplemental security income under Title XVI. The court held that the ALJ did not commit harmful legal error in evaluating medical opinions or the claimant’s symptom testimony. The court denied the claimant’s brief, granted the Commissioner’s brief, entered judgment for the Commissioner, and closed the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rebecca L. Pennell
JURISDICTION	U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-CV-00215-RLP
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of an Administrative Law Judge's final decision denying supplemental security income under Title XVI of the Social Security Act.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews the Commissioner's decision under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and may disturb it only if it is unsupported by substantial evidence or based on legal error. The court must uphold findings supported by inferences reasonably drawn from the record when the evidence is susceptible to more than one rational interpretation. Reversal is unavailable for harmless error, and the party appealing generally bears the burden of showing harm.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Asis R. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

agency adjudication

disability definition

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the persuasiveness of the medical opinions of Drs. Peter Weir, Jeffrey Jamison, and Jonathan Ryan under the applicable Social Security regulations.
2. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the claimant's testimony concerning the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of his symptoms.
3. Whether any alleged errors in evaluating the medical opinions or symptom testimony were harmful and warranted reversal under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ adequately explained why Dr. Weir's opinion limiting the claimant to light work was unpersuasive, relying on the opinion's lack of support in Dr. Weir's examination findings and its inconsistency with the longitudinal record, treatment history, and state-agency assessments.
2. The ALJ did not err in accepting Dr. Jamison's opinion as largely persuasive while declining to adopt unsupported lifting and postural limitations and the four-hour standing or walking limitation.
3. The ALJ did not commit reversible error in evaluating Dr. Ryan's psychological opinion; even assuming error in rejecting some of the opinion's mild-to-moderate limitations, any error was harmless.
4. The ALJ provided legally sufficient reasons for rejecting the claimant's statements about the intensity, persistence, and limiting effects of his symptoms.
5. The Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence and free of harmful legal error; the claimant was not entitled to supplemental security income.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The scope of review is limited; the Commissioner’s decision will be disturbed “only if it is not supported by substantial evidence or is based on legal error.”” (at 2)

“Second, “[i]f the claimant meets the first test and there is no evidence of malingering, the ALJ can only reject the claimant’s testimony about the severity of the symptoms if [the ALJ] gives ‘specific, clear and convincing reasons’ for the rejection.”” (at 9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Asis R., born in 1964, alleged that a back injury sustained in 2001 had progressively worsened and prevented him from working because of back pain and mental limitations. The ALJ found lumbar degenerative disc disease to be a severe impairment, rejected ADHD as severe, assessed a full range of medium work, and found that the claimant could perform his past work as a sheet metal worker. The district court relied on treatment records showing generally normal clinical findings, the claimant's activities including putting in fence posts, removing

bushes, and practicing martial arts or Brazilian judo, and the absence of reported lumbar symptoms during treatment for other conditions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The claimant applied for Title XVI supplemental security income alleging disability beginning July 1, 2020. The application was denied initially and on reconsideration; after a telephonic hearing at which the claimant did not appear, the ALJ issued an unfavorable decision on May 9, 2024. The Appeals Council denied review, and the claimant sought review in the Eastern District of Washington. The district court denied the claimant's brief, granted the Commissioner's brief, affirmed the Commissioner's decision, entered judgment for the defendant, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Hill v. Astrue, 698 F.3d 1153, 1158 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Molina v. Astrue, 674 F.3d 1104, 1111-1112, 1115 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Shinseki v. Sanders, 556 U.S. 396, 409-410, 129 S. Ct. 1696 (2009)
- Gamble v. Chater, 68 F.3d 319, 320-321 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Embrey v. Bowen, 849 F.2d 418 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Ford v. Saul, 950 F.3d 1141, 1154 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Tackett v. Apfel, 180 F.3d 1094, 1098 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Beltran v. Astrue, 700 F.3d 386, 389 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Vasquez v. Astrue, 572 F.3d 586, 591 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Ghanim v. Colvin, 763 F.3d 1154, 1163 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Garrison v. Colvin, 759 F.3d 995, 1015 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Moore v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec. Admin., 278 F.3d 920, 924 (9th Cir. 2002)