

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 92-8456  
Summary Calendar

---

WILLIAM D. BROOKS,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

VERSUS

LOUIS W. SULLIVAN, M.D., Secretary,  
Department of Health and Human Services,

Defendant-Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Texas  
(A-91-CA-365)

---

(February 19, 1993)

Before JOLLY, DUHÉ, and BARKSDALE, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:<sup>1</sup>

Appellant sought social security disability insurance benefits alleging that he had been disabled since 1985 as a result of back problems and related pain stemming from an injury in 1973. Following an evidentiary hearing, an administrative law judge found that while Appellant did suffer from back problems that made it impossible for him to continue his past relevant heavy work, he nevertheless had the

---

<sup>1</sup> Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

capacity for light work and was, therefore, not disabled. Appellant sought review of this conclusion arguing that he was limited to sedentary work. The Appeals Council denied review and appellant filed a petition in the district court seeking review of this final determination. The district court affirmed the Secretary's decision and Claimant appeals. We find no error and affirm.

Appellant basically contends that the Secretary's decision is not supported by substantial evidence in light of Appellant's testimony and the medical evidence. We have carefully reviewed the record, the findings of the district court, and the administrative law judge, and are firmly convinced that both applied the proper legal standards and analysis and that the findings are supported by substantial evidence. We will not here specifically address each argument advanced by Appellant, although each has been carefully considered, but we do address the argument that the 1989 medical opinion upon which Appellant relies requires a finding of disability. Contrary to Appellant's contention, the ALJ did not reject this opinion. His conclusions do not conflict with the conclusions of that report. After considering the report the ALJ found only that Appellant was not disabled. The medical report merely identified Appellant's impairments, cautioned against increasing physical activity and suggested he seek more care as his symptoms worsened. The ALJ applied these findings to the medical-vocational guidelines. He did not ignore these findings.

On the record as a whole, the Secretary's decision is appropriately supported.

AFFIRMED.