

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Darione P. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

Darione P. v. Bisignano, No. 25-cv-00060-SH (N.D. Okla. Mar. 24, 2026) · No. 25-cv-00060-SH · Decided
March 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of the plaintiff’s Title II and Title XVI disability benefits claims. The court held that the administrative law judge properly evaluated the supportability and consistency of a medical opinion under the applicable Social Security regulations and that the decision was supported by substantial evidence. The court entered judgment for the Commissioner.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan E. Huntsman, Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	March 24, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-00060-SH
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's final decision denying Title II and Title XVI Social Security disability benefits. The court affirmed the Commissioner's decision.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed whether the Commissioner applied the correct legal standards and whether the decision was supported by substantial evidence. The court was required to examine the record as a whole, including evidence detracting from the administrative findings, but could not reweigh the evidence or substitute its judgment for the Commissioner's.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Darione P. v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

disability definition

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the supportability and consistency of the medical opinion of Laurie Ray, PA-C.
2. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity assessment and resulting finding of no disability were supported by substantial evidence.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ sufficiently articulated and supported his evaluation of Ray's opinion under the regulatory supportability and consistency requirements.
2. The Commissioner's finding that Plaintiff was not disabled was supported by substantial evidence and was affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Judicial review of the Commissioner’s final decision is limited to determining whether the Commissioner has applied the correct legal standards and whether the decision is supported by substantial evidence.” (Section I)

“The ALJ’s supportability analysis was sufficiently articulated and supported by substantial evidence.” (Section V.B)

“For the foregoing reasons, the Commissioner’s decision finding Plaintiff not disabled is AFFIRMED.” (Section VI)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Darione P. alleged disability based primarily on post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, insomnia, bipolar disorder, and a sleep disorder. The ALJ found severe impairments of major depressive disorder, PTSD, and generalized anxiety disorder, but determined that Plaintiff retained the residual functional capacity to perform work at all exertional levels with mental limitations, including restrictions to simple and detailed but not complex tasks and no public interaction. Plaintiff had no past relevant work, but the vocational expert identified jobs existing in significant numbers in the national economy that she could perform.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff applied for Title II and Title XVI benefits in July 2023, alleging disability beginning November 30, 2022. The claims were denied initially and on reconsideration. After a hearing, an administrative law judge found Plaintiff not disabled, and the Appeals Council denied review on December 16, 2024. Plaintiff then appealed to the district court, which affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Bowen v. Yuckert, 482 U.S. 137, 146 n.5 (1987)
- Williams v. Bowen, 844 F.2d 748, 750 (10th Cir. 1988)
- Grogan v. Barnhart, 399 F.3d 1257, 1261-62 (10th Cir. 2005)
- Biestek v. Berryhill, 587 U.S. 97, 103 (2019)
- Consolidated Edison Co. v. NLRB, 305 U.S. 197, 229 (1938)
- Bowman v. Astrue, 511 F.3d 1270, 1272 (10th Cir. 2008)
- White v. Barnhart, 287 F.3d 903, 908 (10th Cir. 2002)
- Hardman v. Barnhart, 362 F.3d 676, 681 (10th Cir. 2004)
- Clifton v. Chater, 79 F.3d 1007, 1009-10 (10th Cir. 1996)
- Mays v. Colvin, 739 F.3d 569, 576 (10th Cir. 2014)
- Chapo v. Astrue, 682 F.3d 1285, 1288 (10th Cir. 2012)
- Riley v. Commissioner, No. 25-5007, 2025 WL 3276227, at *2 (10th Cir. Nov. 25, 2025) (unpublished)
- Best-Willie v. Colvin, 514 F. App'x 728, 733 (10th Cir. 2013)
- Wild v. Dudek, No. 24-CV-10-GLJ, 2025 WL 785212, at *5 (E.D. Okla. Mar. 12, 2025)
- Harrison v. Commissioner, SSA, No. 22-4108, 2024 WL 1856553, at *4 (10th Cir. Apr. 29, 2024) (unpublished)