

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 95-31145  
Summary Calendar**

---

**FELICIEN LEJEUNE,**

**Plaintiff-Appellant,**

**v.**

**SHIRLEY S. CHATER, Commissioner  
of Social Security,**

**Defendant-Appellee.**

---

**Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Louisiana**

---

June 5, 1996

Before WISDOM, DAVIS, and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

The plaintiff-appellant, Felicien LeJeune, appeals the district court's judgment that the defendant-appellee, the Social Security Commissioner, correctly denied disability benefits to LeJeune. LeJeune contends that the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") assigned to his case improperly relied on certain medical evidence in the record, and ignored evidence indicating that LeJeune was disabled. LeJeune also maintains that the ALJ improperly relied exclusively on the Social Security Commission's Medical-Vocational guidelines in determining that LeJeune maintained the Residual Functional Capacity ("RFC") to perform medium work. Finally, LeJeune argues that ALJ improperly found that LeJeune was literate and "marginally educated" in its consideration of LeJeune's ability to find alternate employment.

This court conducts only a limited review of a denial of disability benefits. We examine the

---

\* Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.

decision for two issues: 1) whether the Commissioner applied the proper legal standards; and 2) whether the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole.<sup>2</sup> In applying this standard, the court may not reweigh the evidence or try the issues *de novo*.<sup>3</sup>

Given this limited review, we find no error in the judgment of the district court. We have reviewed the administrative record, the district court record, and the briefs filed by the parties. We agree with the district court's determination that the ALJ's decision comports with all relevant legal standards, and that substantial evidence exists to support its findings. Accordingly, we AFFIRM the judgment of the district court.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Anthony v. Sullivan*, 954 F.2d 289, 292 (5th Cir 1992).

<sup>3</sup> *Villa v. Sullivan*, 895 F.2d 1019, 1021-22 (5th Cir. 1990).