

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

SEP 22, 2011

JOHN LEY

CLERK

No. 11-10779

Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 1:09-cv-02485-TCB

KHALID H. SYED,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Georgia

(September 22, 2011)

Before MARCUS, WILSON and BLACK, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Khalid Syed appeals the district court's order affirming the Commissioner's denial of his applications for Disabled Adult Child's ("DAC") Insurance Benefits,

Disability Benefits, Disability Insurance Benefits (“DIB”), and Supplemental Social Security Income (“SSI”). On appeal, Syed argues that: (1) the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) did not apply the appropriate legal standard in assessing his mental limitations, as she failed to apply the Psychiatric Review Technique Form (“PRTF”); (2) the district court erred in not finding that the magistrate provided post hoc rationale for the ALJ’s residual functioning capacity (“RFC”) determination; (3) substantial medical evidence indicates greater limitations than those found by the ALJ; and (4) because the hypothetical question posed did not include any limitations regarding concentration or attention deficits, the testimony of the vocational expert (“VE”) cannot provide substantial evidence to support a finding that he is not disabled. After careful review, we affirm.<sup>1</sup>

We review the Commissioner’s decision for substantial evidence. Winschel v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec., 631 F.3d 1176, 1178 (11th Cir. 2011). “Substantial evidence is more than a scintilla and is such relevant evidence as a reasonable person would accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” Id. (quotations omitted).

---

<sup>1</sup> As an initial matter, we review the decision of the ALJ as the Commissioner’s final decision when the ALJ denies benefits and the Appeals Council denies review of the ALJ’s decision. See Doughty v. Apfel, 245 F.3d 1274, 1278 (11th Cir. 2001); Miles v. Chater, 84 F.3d 1397, 1400 (11th Cir. 1996) (noting that our review in a social security case is the same as that of the district court). Because we review the decision of the ALJ, we need not consider Syed’s arguments with respect to the post hoc rationale in the magistrate’s report and recommendation, or any other errors in the district court’s opinion.

The Commissioner uses

a five-step, sequential evaluation process . . . to determine whether a claimant is disabled: (1) whether the claimant is currently engaged in substantial gainful activity; (2) whether the claimant has a severe impairment or combination of impairments; (3) whether the impairment meets or equals the severity of the specified impairments in the Listing of Impairments; (4) based on [the RFC] assessment, whether the claimant can perform any of his or her past relevant work despite the impairment; and (5) whether there are significant numbers of jobs in the national economy that the claimant can perform given the claimant’s RFC, age, education, and work experience.

Id. We do not re-weigh the evidence, decide facts anew, or make credibility determinations. Moore v. Barnhart, 405 F.3d 1208, 1211 (11th Cir. 2005).

At Step Two of the evaluation process, the ALJ must use a “special technique” dictated by the PRTF for evaluating mental impairments. Moore, 405 F.3d at 1213; 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520a-(a). This technique requires separate evaluations on a four-point scale of how the claimant’s mental impairment impacts four functional areas: “activities of daily living; social functioning; concentration, persistence, or pace; and episodes of decompensation.” Moore, 405 F.3d at 1213; see 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520a-(c)(3-4). The ALJ must incorporate the results of this technique into the findings and conclusions. Moore, 405 F.3d at 1213-14; 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520a-(e)(2).

At Step Four of the evaluation process, the ALJ must determine a claimant’s RFC by considering all relevant medical and other evidence. See Phillips v.

Barhnhart, 357 F.3d 1232, 1238-39 (11th Cir. 2004). RFC is an assessment, based upon all of the relevant evidence, of a claimant’s ability to do work despite his impairment. Lewis v. Callahan, 125 F.3d 1436, 1440 (11th Cir. 1997). In assessing RFC, the ALJ must state with particularity the weight given different medical opinions and the reasons for doing so. Sharfarz v. Bowen, 825 F.2d 278, 279 (11th Cir. 1987).

At Step Five of the evaluation process, the burden shifts to the Commissioner to prove that other jobs exist in the national economy that the claimant can perform. Wolfe v. Chater, 86 F.3d 1072, 1077 (11th Cir. 1996). “The ALJ must articulate specific jobs that the claimant is able to perform, and this finding must be supported by substantial evidence, not mere intuition or conjecture.” Wilson v. Barnhart, 284 F.3d 1219, 1227 (11th Cir. 2002). One manner of determining this is for the ALJ to ask a VE hypothetical questions “to establish whether someone with the limitations that the ALJ has previously determined that the claimant has will be able to secure employment in the national economy.” Phillips, 357 F.3d at 1232. In order for a VE’s testimony to constitute substantial evidence, the ALJ must pose a hypothetical question that comprises all of the claimant’s impairments. Winschel, 631 F.3d at 1180. However, the ALJ is not required to include findings in the hypothetical that the ALJ has found to be unsupported. Crawford v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec., 363 F.3d

1155, 1161 (11th Cir. 2004). When medical evidence demonstrates that a claimant can engage in simple, routine tasks or unskilled work despite limitations in concentration, persistence, and pace, courts have concluded that limiting the hypothetical to include only unskilled work sufficiently accounts for such limitations. Winschel, 631 F.3d at 1180-81.

In this case, the ALJ addressed Syed’s mental limitations in accordance with the PRTF. Following a discussion of the pertinent medical evidence and Syed’s school records as they related to Syed’s mental impairments, including discrediting Syed’s higher Global Assessment Functioning (“GAF”) scores because they were not generated by a physician or psychologist, the ALJ specifically addressed Syed’s mental limitations pursuant to 20 C.F.R. § 404.1520a-(c)(3-4). The ALJ found the following mental limitations as set forth in the mental listings: “mild restriction of activities of daily living; moderate difficulties in maintaining social functioning; moderate difficulties in maintaining concentration, persistence or pace, and no episodes of decompensation.” The ALJ incorporated these findings into the five-step, sequential evaluation process, during which the ALJ concluded that Syed was not disabled. Accordingly, the ALJ applied the appropriate legal standard in assessing Syed’s mental limitations.

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.