

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE

William Paul Luttrell, Jr. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social
Security

Luttrell v. Bisignano · No. 2:25-cv-02140-BCL-cgc · Decided June 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of William Paul Luttrell, Jr.’s application for Disability Insurance Benefits. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge adequately evaluated the supportability and consistency of a consultative examiner’s opinion concerning Luttrell’s physical limitations and that the decision was supported by substantial evidence.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brian C. Lea
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee
DECIDED	June 8, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02140-BCL-cgc
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review of the Commissioner's denial of Disability Insurance Benefits under Title II of the Social Security Act. The parties presented the question whether the Administrative Law Judge properly evaluated the opinion of consultative examiner Willyn Jenkins, M.D., in determining Plaintiff's residual functional capacity.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Court reviewed whether the ALJ applied the correct legal standards and whether the findings were supported by substantial evidence. Under that deferential standard, the Court did not resolve conflicting testimony or independently evaluate credibility and deferred to the ALJ if substantial evidence supported the decision.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation or stated precedential designation in the source.

PARTIES

William Paul Luttrell, Jr. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

agency adjudication

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security law

administrative law

disability benefits

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the supportability and consistency of Dr. Jenkins's medical opinion under 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520c.
2. Whether the ALJ's residual-functional-capacity determination and finding that Plaintiff was not disabled were supported by substantial evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ adequately evaluated the supportability and consistency of Dr. Jenkins's opinion and provided sufficient reasons for finding it unpersuasive, including evidence concerning Plaintiff's daily activities, keyboarding, examination findings, treatment records, and the absence of objective testing supporting certain claimed limitations.
2. The Commissioner's decision denying Plaintiff Disability Insurance Benefits was supported by substantial evidence and was affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The substantial-evidence standard ... presupposes that there is a zone of choice within which the decisionmakers can go either way, without interference by the courts.”

“the governing standards do not require the ALJ to write a treatise.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged disability beginning June 30, 2023, based on multiple physical and mental impairments, including PTSD, anxiety, traumatic brain injury, vertigo, radiculopathy, lumbar degenerative arthritis, and spinal stenosis. The ALJ determined that Plaintiff retained the residual functional capacity for a restricted range of light work, including the ability to perform simple tasks with customary breaks and limited social interaction, and found that jobs existed in the national economy that he could perform. Plaintiff challenged only the ALJ's evaluation of consultative examiner Dr. Jenkins's opinion that Plaintiff could lift less than ten pounds, stand and walk for less than two hours, and had difficulty with fine manipulation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff applied for Disability Insurance Benefits on July 18, 2023. His application was denied initially and on reconsideration. After a hearing on October 10, 2024, the ALJ found Plaintiff not disabled on October 23, 2024. The District Court reviewed the Commissioner's decision and affirmed it, directing the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Norris v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 139 F.4th 541, 545 (6th Cir. 2025)
- Blakely v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 581 F.3d 399, 406 (6th Cir. 2009)
- Adams v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., No. 23-3284, 2023 WL 6366106, at *3 (6th Cir. Sept. 28, 2023)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-ten/2026/william-paul-luttrell-jr-v-frank-bisignano-commissioner-of-sjmr94c>