

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 09-2621

---

Wilma F. Bankston,

Appellant,

v.

Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner,  
Social Security Administration,

Appellee.

\*  
\*  
\* Appeal from the United States  
\* District Court for the  
\* Eastern District of Arkansas.  
\*  
\* [UNPUBLISHED]  
\*  
\*  
\*

---

Submitted: March 19, 2010

Filed: March 26, 2010

---

Before BYE, RILEY, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Wilma F. Bankston appeals the district court's<sup>1</sup> order affirming the denial of disability insurance benefits. Bankston alleged disability from anxiety, depression, diabetes, arthritis, headaches, a seizure disorder, and short-term memory loss. After a hearing, an administrative law judge determined that Bankston's severe impairments--major depression, Type II diabetes with neuropathy, arthritis, and

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable James M. Moody, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable H. David Young, United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

obesity--did not meet or equal the requirements of any listing, alone or combined, and that her subjective complaints were not entirely credible. The ALJ concluded further, relying on the testimony of a vocational expert and using the Medical Vocational Guidelines as a framework, that even though Bankston's residual functional capacity precluded her past relevant work, she could perform other jobs existing in significant numbers. The Appeals Council denied review, and the district court affirmed. Having conducted careful de novo review of the record and the parties' submissions on appeal, we agree with the district court that substantial evidence on the record as a whole supports the denial of benefits. See Tilley v Astrue, 580 F.3d 675, 679 (8th Cir. 2009) (standard of review). We reject without further discussion the arguments in Bankston's counseled brief, because they are unsupported by the record, are legally unsupported, or are not sufficiently developed.

Accordingly, we affirm. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

---