

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ALABAMA

Robert A. Snodgrass v. Frank J. Bisignano, Commissioner of Social
Security

Snodgrass v. Bisignano · No. Civil Action No. 25-0519-MU · Decided June 1, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama reviewed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of Robert A. Snodgrass’s claim for Disability Insurance Benefits. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge properly evaluated the medical opinions, adequately supported the residual functional capacity determination, and affirmed the Commissioner’s decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama
WRITING FOR THE COURT	P. Bradley Murray
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama
DECIDED	June 1, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 25-0519-MU
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying a period of disability and Disability Insurance Benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews whether the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence and based on proper legal standards. The court may not decide facts anew, reweigh the evidence, or substitute its judgment for that of the Commissioner.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Robert A. Snodgrass v. Frank J. Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- exhaustion of remedies
- 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 Dr. Jessica Shenese's medical opinion after the Appeals Council remanded for consideration of that opinion.
2. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the consistency of Dr. Kopp's medical opinion with the other medical and nonmedical evidence after remand.
3. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity determination and resulting denial of Disability Insurance Benefits were supported by substantial evidence and based on proper legal standards.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ adequately addressed Dr. Shenese's opinion by finding its stated limitations supported by the examination, explaining that the limitations were not expressed in quantifiable vocational terms, and incorporating verifiable limitations into the RFC. Any failure to expressly label the opinion's overall persuasiveness was harmless.
2. The ALJ properly evaluated Dr. Kopp's opinion, including its consistency with other medical and nonmedical evidence, and adequately supported the conclusion that the opinion was unpersuasive.
3. The Commissioner's decision denying Snodgrass Disability Insurance Benefits was supported by substantial evidence and based on proper legal standards.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The undersigned has considered these limitations and put the verifiable limitations in the RFC using vocationally-relevant terms." (PageID. 55)

"This Court is limited to a determination of whether the ALJ's decision is supported by substantial evidence and based on proper legal standards." (PageID. 58)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Snodgrass alleged disability beginning March 5, 2021, based principally on spinal and neurological impairments, and later also alleged depression, anxiety, hearing loss, tinnitus, and vision impairment. The ALJ found severe physical and mental impairments but determined that Snodgrass retained the residual functional capacity for sedentary work with additional physical and mental restrictions. The ALJ further found that Snodgrass had no past relevant work but could perform jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy through his date last insured, December 31, 2023.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Snodgrass applied for Disability Insurance Benefits, and the application was denied initially and on reconsideration. After a hearing, an ALJ issued an unfavorable decision, which the Appeals Council remanded for further evaluation of medical-opinion evidence. Following a second hearing, the ALJ again denied benefits,

and the Appeals Council denied review, making the ALJ's decision the Commissioner's final decision. After exhausting administrative remedies, Snodgrass sought judicial review, and the district court affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Moore v. Barnhart, 405 F.3d 1208, 1211 (11th Cir. 2005)
- Watkins v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 457 F. App'x 868, 870 (11th Cir. 2012) (per curiam)
- Phillips v. Barnhart, 357 F.3d 1232, 1237 (11th Cir. 2004)
- Jones v. Apfel, 190 F.3d 1224, 1228 (11th Cir. 1999)
- Winschel v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 631 F.3d 1176, 1178 (11th Cir. 2011)
- Chester v. Bowen, 792 F.2d 129, 131 (11th Cir. 1986)
- MacGregor v. Bowen, 786 F.2d 1050, 1053 (11th Cir. 1986)
- Green v. Soc. Sec. Admin., 223 F. App'x 915, 923 (11th Cir. 2007)
- Pritchett v. Colvin, Civ. A. No. 12-0768-M, 2013 WL 3894960, at *5 (S.D. Ala. July 29, 2013)
- Jones v. Colvin, CA 14-00247-C, 2015 WL 5737156, at *23 (S.D. Ala. Sept. 30, 2015)
- Ricks v. Astrue, No. 3:10-cv-975-TEM, 2012 WL 1020428, at *9 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 27, 2012)