

FILED

SEP 25 2015

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

L. MONEKE THOMAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting  
Commissioner of Social Security  
Administration,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 13-36162

D.C. No. 2:13-cv-00572-JPD

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Western District of Washington  
James P. Donohue II, Magistrate Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 26, 2015

Before: GOODWIN, PREGERSON, and BERZON, Circuit Judges.

Larreteyer Moneke Thomas appeals the district court's decision affirming the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of her application for supplemental security income under Title XVI of the Social Security Act. We review the district court's order de novo, and may set aside the denial of benefits only if it is not

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

supported by substantial evidence or is based on legal error. *Molina v. Astrue*, 674 F.3d 1104, 1110 (9th Cir. 2012). Where evidence is susceptible to more than one rational interpretation, we must uphold the administrative law judge's ("ALJ") findings "if they are supported by inferences reasonably drawn from the record." *Id.* at 1111. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

Thomas's contention that the ALJ erred in affording little weight to Dr. Connell's opinion regarding her social functioning lacks merit. The ALJ provided specific and legitimate reasons, supported by substantial evidence in the record, for the assessment of Dr. Connell's opinion. *See Bayliss v. Barnhart*, 427 F.3d 1211, 1216 (9th Cir. 2005). Thomas's contention that the ALJ erred in finding that Thomas's allegations regarding her mental impairments were not credible also lacks merit. The ALJ offered specific, clear and convincing reasons for finding Thomas not credible in light of her daily activities, her failure to follow treatment and the lack of objective support for her allegations. *See Lingenfelter v. Astrue*, 504 F.3d 1028, 1040 (9th Cir. 2007); *see also Carmickle v. Comm'r Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 533 F.3d 1155, 1161 (9th Cir. 2008).

**AFFIRMED.**