

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Tonia G. v. Commissioner of Social Security

Tonia G. v. Commissioner of Social Security · No. 24-CV-6322-FPG · Decided March 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of New York reviewed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of Tonia G.’s application for Supplemental Security Income. The court held that the administrative law judge’s residual functional capacity determination was supported by substantial evidence and granted the Commissioner’s motion for judgment on the pleadings, denied the plaintiff’s motion, and dismissed the complaint with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of New York
DECIDED	March 2, 2026
DOCKET	24-CV-6322-FPG
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Action under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) seeking review of the Commissioner of Social Security's final decision denying Supplemental Security Income benefits; both parties moved for judgment on the pleadings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews the Commissioner's final decision to determine whether it is supported by substantial evidence and based on the correct legal standards; review is not de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court decision designated per curiam, with no reporter citation or precedential-status determination in the supplied text.
PARTIES	Tonia G. v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- motion for judgment on the pleadings
- judicial review of agency action
- agency adjudication
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ's finding that Plaintiff could perform light work, including standing and walking for six hours in an eight-hour workday, was supported by substantial evidence.
2. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated the consistency and supportability of the medical opinions.
3. Whether the ALJ improperly relied on Plaintiff's noncompliance with treatment and activities of daily living.
4. Whether any reliance on a physician's comment reflecting an improper disability standard required remand.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ's finding that Plaintiff could perform light work, including standing and walking for six hours in an eight-hour workday, was supported by substantial evidence and correct legal standards.
2. The ALJ sufficiently evaluated the consistency and supportability of the medical opinions, and remand was not warranted merely because Plaintiff identified evidence that could support a different conclusion.
3. The ALJ's consideration of Plaintiff's medication noncompliance and inhaler practices did not require remand because noncompliance was only one of several factors considered and did not form the sole basis for the RFC determination.
4. The ALJ properly relied on Plaintiff's reported activities of daily living as one factor supporting the RFC determination.
5. Any error arising from the ALJ's reliance on Dr. Mack's comment was harmless and did not require remand.

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."

"Substantial evidence means more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."

"The mere fact that Plaintiff can identify other evidence to support a different conclusion does not entitle her to relief."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff applied for Supplemental Security Income, alleging disability based on multiple physical and mental impairments, including degenerative lumbar spine disease, asthma, diabetes, depression, and anxiety. The ALJ found that Plaintiff had severe impairments but retained the residual functional capacity for light work with additional limitations, including the ability to stand or walk for six hours in an eight-hour workday. Because

Plaintiff had no past relevant work, the ALJ determined at step five that jobs existed in significant numbers in the national economy that Plaintiff could perform.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff applied for Supplemental Security Income, and the claim was denied initially and on reconsideration. After a hearing, the ALJ found Plaintiff not disabled, and the Appeals Council denied review. Plaintiff then sought judicial review, while both parties moved for judgment on the pleadings.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Talavera v. Astrue, 697 F.3d 145, 151 (2d Cir. 2012)
- Moran v. Astrue, 569 F.3d 108, 112 (2d Cir. 2009)
- Schaal v. Apfel, 134 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir. 1998)
- Wagner v. Secretary of Health & Human Services, 906 F.2d 856, 860 (2d Cir. 1990)
- Bowen v. City of New York, 476 U.S. 467, 470-71 (1986)
- Rosa v. Callahan, 168 F.3d 72, 77 (2d Cir. 1999)
- Ricky K. v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 20-CV-1400MWP, 2022 WL 61008, at *5 (W.D.N.Y. Jan. 6, 2022)
- Bonet ex rel. T.B. v. Colvin, 523 F. App'x 58, 59 (2d Cir. 2013) (summary order)
- Harrington v. Colvin, No. 14-CV-6044P, 2015 WL 790756, at *14 (W.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2015)
- Villier on behalf of N.D.D.R. v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 23-893-CV, 2024 WL 2174236, at *3 (2d Cir. May 15, 2024)
- Cichocki v. Astrue, 729 F.3d 172, 178 n.3 (2d Cir. 2013) (per curiam)
- Emery S. v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 20-CV-662, 2021 WL 2592363, at *4 (W.D.N.Y. June 24, 2021)
- Genier v. Astrue, 606 F.3d 46, 49 (2d Cir. 2010)
- Jackson v. Kijakazi, 588 F. Supp. 3d 558, 579 (S.D.N.Y. 2022)
- Zabala v. Astrue, 595 F.3d 402, 409 (2d Cir. 2010)
- Dukes v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 6:19-CV-06025 EAW, 2020 WL 5651610, at *4 (W.D.N.Y. Sept. 23, 2020)
- Gonzalez v. Berryhill, No. 3:17-CV-1385 (SALM), 2018 WL 3956495, at *15 (D. Conn. Aug. 17, 2018)
- Stephanie T. v. Commissioner of Social Security, No. 1:20-CV-0322 CJS, 2021 WL 4189704, at *9 (W.D.N.Y. Sept. 15, 2021)
- Raymond Q. v. Saul, No. 518CV544FJSCFH, 2019 WL 4758269, at *7 (N.D.N.Y. Aug. 7, 2019), report and recommendation adopted sub nom. Raymond Q. v. Commissioner of Social Security, 2019 WL 4757316 (N.D.N.Y. Sept. 30, 2019)

- *Cummings v. Commissioner of Social Security*, No. 3:17-CV-0631, 2018 WL 2209204, at *8 (N.D.N.Y. May 14, 2018)
- *Krull v. Colvin*, 669 F. App'x 31, 32 (2d Cir. 2016) (summary order)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-new-york-united-states-district-court-for-t/2026/tonia-g-v-commissioner-of-social-security-zfedcp1z>