

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-51020
Summary Calendar

ELAINE E. SELVERA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

KENNETH S. APFEL,
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
(A-98-CV-656-AA)

June 13, 2000

Before SMITH, BARKSDALE, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Elaine E. Selvera appeals from a judgment affirming the Commissioner's decision denying social security supplemental income benefits.

Selvera contends: although she has a GED, substantial evidence indicates she is intellectually only at the elementary-education level of performance, and, therefore, the jobs the administrative law judge (ALJ) found capable of performing are

*Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

above her actual ability; the ALJ failed to consider all of her impairments, most notably, her nervousness, anxiety, and depression, and how they interfere with her gainful-work abilities; the ALJ's finding she could perform light work is inconsistent with the evidence, which demonstrates she cannot meet the requirements of the noted jobs, dry cleaner and housekeeper; and the ALJ failed to include all of her limitations in the hypothetical question given the vocational expert, and thus erred by failing to analyze the combined effect of all of her impairments.

Additionally, Selvera challenges the competency of the medical expert at the agency hearing. But, before he testified, she conceded he was "qualified as a medical expert".

Based on our review, the ALJ applied the proper legal standards and substantial evidence supports the benefits-denial. See *Martinez v. Chater*, 64 F.3d 172, 173 (5th Cir. 1995); see also *Bowling v. Shalala*, 36 F.3d 431, 435-36 (5th Cir. 1994) (hypothetical questions for vocational expert).

AFFIRMED