



---

2002 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

---

3-21-2002

## Garner v. Comm Social Security

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2002](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2002)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Garner v. Comm Social Security" (2002). *2002 Decisions*. 193.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2002/193](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2002/193)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2002 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 01-3551

MARLENE GARNER,

Appellant

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

\*JO ANNE B. BARNHART

\*{Pursuant to F.R.A.P. 43(c)}

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

(Dist. Court No. 00-1200)  
District Court Judge: Gustave Diamond

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)  
March 7, 2002

Before: BECKER, Chief Judge, ALITO, and RENDELL, Circuit Judges.

(Opinion Filed: March 21, 2002)

OPINION OF THE COURT

PER CURIAM:

This is an appeal from an order of the District Court affirming  
the decision

of an Administrative Law Judge, which denied Marlene Garner's application for supplemental security income under title XVI of the Social Security Act. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1381-1383f. On appeal to our Court, Garner contends that the decision of the Administrative Law Judge is not supported by substantial evidence and that the Administrative Law Judge committed a variety of other errors.

We have considered Garner's arguments, and we conclude that the decision of the Administrative Law Judge is supported by substantial evidence. We reject Garner's additional arguments.

For these reasons, the decision of the District Court is affirmed.