

appealed. The Appeals Council vacated the ALJ's decision and remanded Strong's claim for further proceedings before the ALJ, including a supplemental hearing.

After conducting a supplemental hearing, the ALJ issued a written decision again denying Strong's claim because Keegan did not receive at least one-half of his support from Timothy Strong for at least a year immediately preceding the date of the application for CIB. The ALJ decided not to use the "pooled fund method," which assumes that all income coming into the household is pooled for the support of the household and that each member shares equally in the funds used for support, to calculate the amount of support that Timothy Strong provided. The Appeals Council denied Strong's request for review and the ALJ's decision became the final decision of the Social Security Commissioner.

Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), Strong filed an action for review of the Commissioner's decision in United States District Court. On September 8, 2003, a Magistrate Judge entered judgment in favor of the Commissioner and Strong's timely appeal followed.¹

Our review of the Commissioner's decision is confined to whether the ALJ applied the correct legal standards and whether the ALJ's factual findings were supported by substantial evidence. 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). "Substantial evidence" means "more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." *Wright v. Massanari*, 321 F.3d 611, 614 (6th Cir. 2003) (quoting *Kirk v. Secretary of Health and Human Servs.*, 667 F.2d 524, 535 (6th Cir. 1981)). We must affirm the ALJ's decision if his findings are drawn from the record and are supported by substantial evidence, even if that evidence

¹Strong also filed CIB claims on behalf of her other two children, Kaia and Rane Wantz. The three cases were consolidated for the purposes of this appeal because they involve the exact same facts and legal issues.

could support a contrary decision. *Casey v. Secretary of Health & Human Servs.*, 987 F.2d 1230, 1233 (6th Cir. 1993).

Having had the benefit of oral argument, and having carefully considered the record on appeal and the briefs of the parties, we are unable to say that the Commissioner's denial of Strong's application for CIB benefits is not supported by substantial evidence. Because the issuance of a full opinion would serve no jurisprudential purpose and would be duplicative, we **AFFIRM** the district court's denial of CIB benefits on the basis of the ALJ's well-reasoned opinion.