

United States Court of Appeals  
For the Eighth Circuit

---

No. 17-2719

---

Lance Gerald Milliman

*Plaintiff - Appellant*

v.

Nancy A. Berryhill, Acting Commissioner of Social Security

*Defendant - Appellee*

---

Appeal from United States District Court  
for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis

---

Submitted: March 29, 2018

Filed: April 16, 2018

[Unpublished]

---

Before WOLLMAN, COLLOTON, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Lance Gerald Milliman appeals a district court<sup>1</sup> order affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. We agree with the

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable David S. Doty, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable Leo I. Brisbois, United States Magistrate Judge for the District of Minnesota.

district court that substantial evidence on the record as a whole supports the denial of Milliman's applications. See Thomas v. Berryhill, 881 F.3d 672, 674 (8th Cir. 2018) (de novo review). Specifically, we find no error in the administrative law judge's (ALJ's) determinations that Milliman's mental impairments were not severe, see Kirby v. Astrue, 500 F.3d 705, 707 (8th Cir. 2007) (impairment is not severe if it amounts only to slight abnormality that would not limit claimant's mental ability to do basic work activities); that Milliman's subjective complaints were not entirely credible, see Bryant v. Colvin, 861 F.3d 779, 782-83 (8th Cir. 2017) (this court defers to ALJ's credibility findings if they are supported by good reasons and substantial evidence); or that Milliman had the residual functional capacity (RFC) for a full range of light work, see Boyd v. Colvin, 831 F.3d 1015, 1020 (8th Cir. 2016) (it is ALJ's responsibility to determine RFC based on all relevant evidence: medical records, observations of treating physicians and others, and claimant's own description of his limitations). We have carefully considered the other matters Milliman raises on appeal, and we conclude that they also provide no basis for reversal.

The judgment is affirmed.

---