United States Court of Appeals

For the Eighth Circuit
No. 21-1924
Tamera Peerson-Kershner
Plaintiff - Appellant
v.
Kilolo Kijakazi, ¹ Acting Commissioner of Social Security Administration
Defendant - Appellee
Appeal from United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas - Ft. Smith
Submitted: December 1, 2021 Filed: December 13, 2021 [Unpublished]
Before GRUENDER, SHEPHERD, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM.

¹Kilolo Kijakazi has been appointed to serve as Acting Commissioner of Social Security, and is substituted as appellee pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 43(c).

Tamera Peerson-Kershner appeals the district court's² order affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits. We find that the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence in the record as a whole. See Kraus v. Saul, 988 F.3d 1019, 1023-24 (8th Cir. 2021) (standard of review). Specifically, we find that the administrative law judge (ALJ) properly evaluated Peerson-Kershner's subjective complaints, see Milam v. Colvin, 794 F.3d 978, 985 (8th Cir. 2015) (ALJ properly considered plaintiff's relatively conservative treatment history); Wildman v. Astrue, 596 F.3d 959, 965 (8th Cir. 2010) (if impairment can be controlled by medication, it cannot be considered disabling); and properly evaluated the medical opinion evidence in determining Peerson-Kershner's residual functional capacity, see Kraus, 988 F.3d at 1025 (ALJ properly discredited treating physician's opinion on checkbox form, which provided no explanation or evidence in support of his conclusions, and which was not consistent with treatment notes); 20 C.F.R. § 404.1513a(b)(1) (state agency medical consultants are highly qualified experts in Social Security disability evaluation). We also find that the ALJ did not fail to fully develop the record, as the available evidence about Peerson-Kershner's impairments was adequate to make a disability determination. See Martise v. Astrue, 641 F.3d 909, 926-27 (8th Cir. 2011) (ALJ is required to order further medical examinations only if existing medical record does not provide sufficient evidence to determine whether claimant is disabled).

The judgment is affirmed.	

²The Honorable Mark E. Ford, United States Magistrate Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, to whom the case was referred for final disposition by consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).