

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Marta N. R. o/b/o S.E.R. v. Commissioner of Social Security

Marta N. R. · No. 24-CV-6186-FPG · Decided March 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of New York reviewed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of a child’s application for Supplemental Security Income. The court held that the administrative law judge’s assessment of the child’s functional limitations and medical opinions was supported by substantial evidence and applied the proper legal standards. Plaintiff’s motion for judgment on the pleadings was denied, the Commissioner’s motion was granted, and the complaint was dismissed with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Frank P. Geraci, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
DECIDED	March 5, 2026
DOCKET	24-CV-6186-FPG
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c) (3) of the Commissioner's final decision denying a child's application for Supplemental Security Income. Both parties moved for judgment on the pleadings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews the Commissioner's decision to determine whether it is supported by substantial evidence and whether the correct legal standard was applied. The court does not determine de novo whether the claimant is disabled.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court decision with no reporter citation
PARTIES	Marta N. R. o/b/o S.E.R. v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- motion for judgment on the pleadings
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

Administrative Law

Civil Procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ's finding that S.E.R. had less than marked limitations in the domain of caring for himself was supported by substantial evidence and sufficiently explained for meaningful judicial review.
2. Whether the ALJ properly considered the regulatory supportability and consistency factors when evaluating the medical opinions.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ's finding that S.E.R. had less than marked limitations in caring for himself was supported by substantial evidence, and the ALJ's explanation permitted meaningful judicial review.
2. The ALJ adequately considered the supportability and consistency factors when evaluating the relevant medical opinions.
3. No remand or reversal was warranted because the Commissioner's decision applied the correct legal standards and was supported by substantial evidence.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Substantial evidence is more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” (Legal Standard)

“For all of the reasons stated, Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (ECF No. 4) is DENIED, and the Commissioner's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (ECF No. 9) is GRANTED.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

S.E.R., a child, applied for Supplemental Security Income based on an alleged disability beginning February 11, 2020. The ALJ found severe impairments including ADHD, learning disorder, anxiety disorder, developmental coordination disorder, childhood obesity, and unspecified sleep disorder. The ALJ found less than marked limitations in five functional domains and a marked limitation only in attending and completing tasks, concluding that S.E.R. was not disabled. The district court relied on evidence of stable or relatively well-controlled symptoms, daily activities, improved academic performance, and age-appropriate self-care abilities in upholding the ALJ's finding concerning the domain of caring for oneself.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an SSI application on S.E.R.'s behalf in February 2021. The application was initially denied, and an administrative hearing was held on September 23, 2022. The ALJ found S.E.R. not disabled on May 22, 2023, and the Appeals Council denied review on February 7, 2024. The district court denied Plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings, granted the Commissioner's motion, and dismissed the complaint with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Brault v. Social Security Administration, Commissioner, 683 F.3d 443, 447-48 (2d Cir. 2012)
- Acierno v. Barnhart, 475 F.3d 77, 80-81 (2d Cir. 2007)
- Lebron v. Kijakazi, No. 20-CV-9543, 2022 WL 3910682, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 31, 2022)
- Davis v. Berryhill, No. 17-CV-6168, 2018 WL 1980251, at *8 (W.D.N.Y. Apr. 27, 2018)
- Genier v. Astrue, 606 F.3d 46, 49 (2d Cir. 2010)
- Emery S. v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 20-CV-662, 2021 WL 2592363, at *4 (W.D.N.Y. June 24, 2021)
- Cichocki v. Astrue, 729 F.3d 172, 177 (2d Cir. 2013)
- Berry v. Schweiker, 675 F.2d 464, 469 (2d Cir. 1982)
- Mongeur v. Heckler, 722 F.2d 1033, 1040 (2d Cir. 1983)
- Carmen M. v. Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, No. 20-CV-06532, 2021 WL 5410550, at *4 (W.D.N.Y. Nov. 19, 2021)
- Darla W. v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 20-CV-1085, 2021 WL 5903286, at *9 (N.D.N.Y. Dec. 14, 2021)