Not For Publication in West's Federal Reporter Citation Limited Pursuant to 1st Cir. Loc. R. 32.3

United States Court of AppealsFor the First Circuit

No. 02-2674

RICHARD J. POISSANT,

Plaintiff, Appellant,

V.

JO ANNE BARNHART, COMMISSIONER OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant, Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Hon. Reginald C. Lindsay, <u>U.S. District Judge</u>]

Before

Lynch, <u>Circuit Judge</u>, Campbell and Stahl, <u>Senior Circuit Judges</u>.

<u>Michael James Kelley</u> on brief for appellant.

<u>Michael J. Sullivan</u>, United States Attorney, <u>Lisa De Soto</u>,
General Counsel, <u>Robert J. Triba</u>, Chief Counsel, <u>María A. Machín</u>,
Assistant Regional Counsel, and <u>Rayford A. Farquhar</u>, Assistant U.S.
Attorney, on brief for appellee.

August 28, 2003

Per Curiam. Claimant Richard J. Poissant has appealed a district court judgment affirming the decision of the Commissioner of Health and Human Services ("Commissioner") which denied the claimant's applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income payments. The claimant's only argument on appeal is that the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") failed to sufficiently support his finding that the claimant's subjective complaints of pain were "not entirely credible." One of the reasons the ALJ partially discounted the claimant's testimony was because of "discrepancies between the claimant's assertions and information contained in the documentary reports." While a more detailed explanation of the discrepancies would have been preferable, see Frustaglia v. Secretary of Health & Human Servs., 829 F.2d 192, 195 (1st Cir. 1987), we have examined the record and find substantial evidence to support the ALJ's finding of discrepancies between the claimant's testimony and the objective medical evidence. These discrepancies are significant and major. They amply support the ALJ's conclusion that the claimant was not entirely credible in respect to his subjective complaints of pain.

The judgment of the district court is affirmed.