



hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Swenson, her husband, and a vocational expert testified.

The ALJ found Swenson was not disabled. The ALJ discounted Swenson's subjective complaints to the extent she alleged total disability, and concluded that Swenson's limitations did not prevent her from performing past relevant work. The Appeals Council considered additional medical records submitted by Swenson, including a report stating a psychologist's opinion that Swenson's pain was genuine, but denied review. The district court affirmed the denial of benefits, and Swenson appeals.

Having reviewed the record, including the new evidence submitted to the Appeals Council, we conclude that substantial evidence on the record as a whole supports the ALJ's evaluation of Swenson's subjective complaints of pain under the standards set forth in Polaski v. Heckler, 739 F.2d 1320, 1322 (8th Cir. 1984), as well as the ALJ's decision that Swenson could perform her past relevant work. See Baumgarten v. Chater, 75 F.3d 366, 368 (8th Cir. 1996) (standard of review).

Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U. S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.