

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
ARKANSAS, NORTHERN DIVISION

Richard Vernon Moore v. Frank J. Bisignano, Commissioner, Social
Security Administration

Moore · No. 3:25-cv-00008-LPR-JJV · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

This proposed findings and recommended disposition addresses Richard Vernon Moore’s appeal of the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. The magistrate judge concluded that the Commissioner’s decision was supported by substantial evidence and was not affected by legal error, recommending that the decision be affirmed and the complaint dismissed with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Northern Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Northern Division
DECIDED	February 18, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-00008-LPR-JJV
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se claimant sought judicial review of the Commissioner of Social Security's final decision denying disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. The magistrate judge recommended affirming the Commissioner's decision and dismissing the complaint with prejudice, subject to review by the assigned district judge.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews whether the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole and whether the claimant was denied benefits because of legal error. Substantial evidence is relevant evidence that a reasonable mind would accept as adequate to support a conclusion. The court must consider evidence detracting from the Commissioner's decision as well as evidence supporting it, but may not reverse merely because substantial evidence would support an opposite decision.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Richard Vernon Moore v. Frank J. Bisignano, Commissioner, Social Security Administration

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action standard of review administrative law appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability administrative law federal appellate review

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income was supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole and was free of legal error.
2. Whether the ALJ failed to develop the administrative record by not ordering additional testing or medical examinations concerning alleged neuropathy following a spinal cord injury.
3. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity assessment was supported by the medical evidence and the record as a whole.

HOLDINGS

1. A claimant challenging the development of the record must show both that the ALJ failed to develop necessary evidence and that the failure caused unfairness or prejudice. Moore showed neither, and the existing record was sufficient for an informed disability determination.
2. The Commissioner's determination that Moore was not disabled was supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole and was not based on legal error.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This review function is extremely limited. The court’s function on review is to determine whether the Commissioner’s decision is supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole and to analyze whether Plaintiff was denied benefits due to legal error.”

“The test is whether there is substantial evidence on the record as a whole which supports the decision of the ALJ.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Moore alleged disability beginning August 3, 2021, based on physical and mental impairments arising in part from prior spinal, hip, and shoulder problems and related surgeries. The ALJ found severe impairments involving the cervical and lumbosacral spine, a chronic T9 compression fracture, shoulder disorders, thyroid disorder, alcohol use disorder, anxiety, intermittent explosive disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and an affective mood disorder. The ALJ limited Moore to a reduced range of sedentary work with physical,

environmental, social, and adaptive restrictions, and relied on vocational-expert testimony identifying jobs he could perform. The magistrate judge concluded that the record, including more than 1,000 pages of medical evidence and largely normal examinations, supported the ALJ's findings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Administrative Law Judge found that Moore was not disabled because, despite his impairments, he retained the residual functional capacity to perform a reduced range of sedentary work and could perform jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy. The Appeals Council denied review, making the ALJ's decision the Commissioner's final decision. The magistrate judge initially recommended a Sentence Six remand under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), but the presiding district judge disagreed and referred the case back for consideration of whether substantial evidence supported the Commissioner's decision. The magistrate judge then recommended affirmance and dismissal with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Long v. Chater, 108 F.3d 185, 187 (8th Cir. 1997)
- Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971)
- Reynolds v. Chater, 82 F.3d 254, 257 (8th Cir. 1996)
- Woolf v. Shalala, 3 F.3d 1210, 1213 (8th Cir. 1993)
- Combs v. Astrue, 243 Fed. Appx. 200, 204 (8th Cir. 2007)
- Martise v. Astrue, 641 F.3d 909, 926-27 (8th Cir. 2011)
- Haley v. Massanari, 258 F.3d 742, 749 (8th Cir. 2001)
- Anderson v. Shalala, 51 F.3d 777, 779 (8th Cir. 1995)
- Pena v. Chater, 76 F.3d 906, 908 (8th Cir. 1996)
- Mapes v. Chater, 82 F.3d 259, 262 (8th Cir. 1996)
- Pratt v. Sullivan, 956 F.2d 830, 833 (8th Cir. 1992)
- Reutter ex rel. Reutter v. Barnhart, 372 F.3d 946, 950 (8th Cir. 2004)