

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Lila Anne Jimenez v. Commissioner of Social Security

Jimenez · No. 24-cv-03088-PAB · Decided March 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Colorado reviewed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of Lila Anne Jimenez’s application for disability insurance benefits. The court held that the administrative law judge’s residual functional capacity determination was supported by substantial evidence and affirmed the Commissioner’s decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Philip A. Brimmer
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
DECIDED	March 30, 2026
DOCKET	24-cv-03088-PAB
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's final decision denying disability insurance benefits. The district court reviewed the administrative decision and affirmed it.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court determines whether the Commissioner applied the correct legal standards and whether the decision is supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole. The court may not reweigh the evidence or retry the case, but must examine the entire record, including evidence that detracts from the ALJ's findings. Failure to apply the correct legal test independently warrants reversal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security disability
- administrative law
- federal judicial review

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the supportability and consistency of the physical therapist's medical opinion under the applicable Social Security regulations.
2. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's residual functional capacity finding and resulting determination that plaintiff was not disabled.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ adequately considered the supportability of PT Van Zytveld's opinion even though the ALJ did not expressly label the analysis as a supportability analysis, because the ALJ relied on Van Zytveld's own treatment records and findings.
2. The ALJ adequately explained why PT Van Zytveld's opinion was inconsistent with the medical evidence, neurological examinations, positive response to treatment, and plaintiff's activities, including playing games on her phone, doing puzzles, and driving.
3. The Commissioner's decision was supported by substantial evidence and applied the correct legal standards; the district court therefore affirmed the denial of disability benefits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court finds that the ALJ properly considered the supportability of PT Van Zytveld’s opinion.” (R. at 27-28)

“Accordingly, the Court finds that the ALJ’s determination that plaintiff had an RFC of performing light work is supported by substantial evidence.” (R. at 27-28)

“Therefore, it is ORDERED that the decision of the Commissioner that claimant is not disabled is AFFIRMED.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged disability beginning June 26, 2020, based primarily on Mal de Debarquement syndrome, migraine headaches, orthopedic conditions, obesity, and adjustment disorder. The ALJ found that she retained the residual functional capacity for light work with specified postural, environmental, cognitive, and public-interaction limitations. Plaintiff challenged the ALJ's evaluation of treating physical therapist Chelsea Van Zytveld's opinion that plaintiff could work only two hours per day and had limitations involving close vision, sitting, standing, balance, and noise exposure.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff applied for Title II disability insurance benefits in May 2021. The application was denied initially and on reconsideration; following a February 6, 2024 hearing, an ALJ denied benefits on March 4, 2024. The Appeals Council denied review on September 24, 2024, making the ALJ's decision the Commissioner's final decision. Plaintiff then filed this action, and the district court affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Angel v. Barnhart, 329 F.3d 1208, 1209 (10th Cir. 2003)
- Biestek v. Berryhill, 587 U.S. 97, 102-03 (2019)
- Musgrave v. Sullivan, 966 F.2d 1371, 1374 (10th Cir. 1992)
- Flaherty v. Astrue, 515 F.3d 1067, 1070 (10th Cir. 2008)
- Grogan v. Barnhart, 399 F.3d 1257, 1262 (10th Cir. 2005)
- Thompson v. Sullivan, 987 F.2d 1482, 1487 (10th Cir. 1993)
- Davis v. Erdmann, 607 F.2d 917, 918 n.1 (10th Cir. 1979)
- J.T.L. v. Kijakazi, No. 22-cv-02343-NYW, 2023 WL 5017241, at *4, *8 (D. Colo. Aug. 7, 2023)
- T.D.F. v. Kijakazi, No. 22-cv-02145-MDB, 2023 WL 6249035, at *7 (D. Colo. Sept. 25, 2023)
- Williams v. Bowen, 844 F.2d 748, 750 (10th Cir. 1988)
- Trimiar v. Sullivan, 966 F.2d 1326, 1329 (10th Cir. 1992)
- Casias v. Secretary of Health & Human Services, 933 F.2d 799, 801 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Fischer-Ross v. Barnhart, 431 F.3d 729, 731 (10th Cir. 2005)
- Bowen v. Yuckert, 482 U.S. 137, 146 n.5 (1987)
- Hill v. Sullivan, 924 F.2d 972, 974 (10th Cir. 1991)