

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Candice S. o/b/o W.A. v. Commissioner of Social Security

Candice S. o/b/o W.A. · No. 1:24-cv-00311 (JGW) · Decided March 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of New York reviewed a denial of supplemental security income benefits for a child claimant. The court held that the Administrative Law Judge's finding of a less-than-marked limitation in attending and completing tasks was supported by substantial evidence, denied the plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings, granted the Commissioner's motion, and affirmed the decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	J. Gregory Wehrman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
DECIDED	March 24, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00311 (JGW)
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income benefits for a child. The parties filed cross-motions for judgment on the pleadings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the Commissioner's decision to determine whether it was supported by substantial evidence and based on the correct legal standard. If the evidence was susceptible to more than one rational interpretation, the Commissioner's determination had to be upheld.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum-decision and order; persuasive only
PARTIES	Candice S. o/b/o W.A. v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

motion for judgment on the pleadings

civil procedure

disability definition

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ's finding that W.A. had a less-than-marked limitation in the functional-equivalence domain of attending and completing tasks was supported by substantial evidence.
2. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the opinions of W.A.'s treating psychiatrist, therapist, consultative psychologist, and teacher.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ's finding that W.A. had a less-than-marked limitation in attending and completing tasks was supported by substantial evidence, and the record provided no basis for remand.
2. The ALJ properly considered the conflicting medical, therapeutic, consultative, and teacher opinions and reasonably relied on the portions consistent with the longitudinal record.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In reviewing a final decision of the SSA, this Court is limited to determining whether the SSA’s conclusions were supported by substantial evidence in the record and were based on a correct legal standard.” (Section II.A)

“It is not the function of this Court to re-weigh evidence or consider de novo whether [W.A.] is disabled.” (Section III.C)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

W.A. was a school-age child alleging ADHD, oppositional defiant disorder, PTSD, and other impairments. The record showed behavioral and attentional difficulties, but school records reflected successful progression through grades, performance at or near grade level with structured support, and mostly no or slight problems in activities within the attending-and-completing-tasks domain. Treatment records also reflected improvement and stability with medication and psychotherapy.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

An application for supplemental security income filed on behalf of W.A. was denied initially and on reconsideration. After a hearing, the ALJ found W.A. not disabled, and the Appeals Council denied review. The district court denied Plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings, granted the Commissioner's motion, affirmed the Commissioner's decision, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Talavera v. Astrue, 697 F.3d 145, 151 (2d Cir. 2012)
- Moran v. Astrue, 569 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir. 2009)
- Williams v. Bowen, 859 F.2d 255, 258 (2d Cir. 1988)
- McIntyre v. Colvin, 758 F.3d 146, 149 (2d Cir. 2014)
- Yancey v. Apfel, 145 F.3d 106, 111 (2d Cir. 1998)
- Kristina G. o/b/o M.E.G. v. Commissioner of Social Security, 1:23-cv-00904-EAW, 2024 WL 3633355, at *3 (W.D.N.Y. Aug. 2, 2024)
- White o/b/o T.R.W. v. Berryhill, No. 17-cv-6367P, 2019 WL 1367382, at *3, *7 (W.D.N.Y. Mar. 26, 2019)
- Nicole A. o/b/o L.S. v. Commissioner of Social Security, Case No. 1:22-cv-00343 (JGW), 2024 WL 3228001, at *4-*5 (W.D.N.Y. June 28, 2024)
- Taneisha R. o/b/o N.D.P. v. Commissioner of Social Security, 1:23-cv-00098, 2024 WL 1151764, at *3, *5-*6 (W.D.N.Y. Mar. 18, 2024)
- Kellin O. o/b/o K.P.Q. v. Commissioner of Social Security, Case No. 5:23-cv-00812, 2024 WL 2027907, at *6 (N.D.N.Y. Apr. 16, 2024)
- Clark v. Saul, 444 F. Supp. 3d 607, 623 (S.D.N.Y. 2020)