

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO, EASTERN DIVISION

Ashley Rose Schandel v. Commissioner of Social Security

Schandel · No. 5:25-CV-00921-CAB · Decided February 26, 2026

SUMMARY

This Report and Recommendation addresses Ashley Rose Schandel’s challenge to the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of supplemental security income after an age-18 disability redetermination. The magistrate judge concludes that substantial evidence supports the administrative law judge’s findings concerning the applicable listings and residual functional capacity, and recommends affirming the Commissioner’s decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Darrell A. Clay
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	February 26, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-CV-00921-CAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Report and recommendation on judicial review of the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court must affirm if the Commissioner applied the correct legal standards and the findings are supported by substantial evidence. Substantial evidence is more than a scintilla but less than a preponderance and is evidence a reasonable mind might accept as adequate. The court may not reweigh evidence or make credibility determinations, but must reverse for legal error, failure to follow applicable regulations that prejudices the claimant, or an explanation that does not permit meaningful judicial review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Ashley Rose Schandel v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

agency adjudication

disability definition

ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security disability

administrative law

judicial review of agency action

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's Step Three finding that Schandel's impairments did not meet or medically equal the requirements of Listings 12.04, 12.05, 12.06, 12.08, 12.11, or 12.15.
2. Whether the ALJ adequately explained the Step Three findings and fulfilled any duty to develop the record.
3. Whether the childhood disability determination, *Drummond v. Commissioner of Social Security*, or Acquiescence Ruling 98-4(6) bound the ALJ during the adult age-eighteen redetermination.
4. Whether the ALJ improperly cherry-picked evidence or failed to build an accurate and logical bridge between the evidence and the conclusion.
5. Whether the ALJ's residual functional capacity assessment adequately incorporated the limitations stated in the consultative opinion of David Bousquet.

HOLDINGS

1. A childhood disability determination is not dispositive or binding in an adult age-eighteen redetermination because attaining age eighteen is a changed circumstance and the Social Security Act requires application of the adult eligibility criteria.
2. The ALJ's finding that Schandel had no more than moderate limitations in the four Paragraph B areas and therefore did not satisfy the relevant listings was supported by substantial evidence.
3. The ALJ's Step Three explanation was not perfunctory because it addressed each Paragraph B criterion over several pages and identified supporting evidence.
4. The ALJ was not required to adopt David Bousquet's opinion verbatim because the RFC reflected each of the functional limitations Schandel claimed had been omitted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The finding of childhood disability finding is not dispositive nor binding on the adult redetermination."
(Discussion § I.D)

"Following review of the arguments presented, the record, and the applicable law, I recommend the District Court AFFIRM the Commissioner's decision denying SSI." (Conclusion and Recommendation)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Schandel received supplemental security income after being found disabled as a child based primarily on conduct disorder and ADHD. After turning eighteen, she was reevaluated under the adult disability standards; the ALJ found severe physical and mental impairments but concluded that her limitations were no more than moderate in the relevant Paragraph B areas. The ALJ determined that Schandel retained the residual functional capacity for limited light work, including simple and repetitive tasks with restricted social interaction and workplace changes, and that she could perform work as a cleaner or housekeeper, marker, or routing clerk.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Schandel was found disabled as a child, but following an age-eighteen redetermination, the Social Security Administration found that she was no longer disabled. After an initial ALJ decision, Appeals Council denial, and remand by the district court, a second ALJ again found her not disabled as of May 28, 2018. The Appeals Council declined review on March 14, 2025, and Schandel filed this action on May 7, 2025. The magistrate judge recommends affirming the Commissioner's decision.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Walters v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 127 F.3d 525, 528-29 (6th Cir. 1997)
- *McClanahan v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 474 F.3d 830, 833 (6th Cir. 2006)
- *Besaw v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 966 F.2d 1028, 1030 (6th Cir. 1992)
- *Brooks v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 531 F. App'x 636, 641 (6th Cir. 2013)
- *Brainard v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 889 F.2d 679, 681 (6th Cir. 1989)
- *Jones v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 336 F.3d 469, 477 (6th Cir. 2003)
- *Mullen v. Bowen*, 800 F.2d 535, 545 (6th Cir. 1986)
- *Wilson v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 378 F.3d 541, 546-47 (6th Cir. 2004)
- *Fleischer v. Astrue*, 774 F. Supp. 2d 875, 877 (N.D. Ohio 2011)
- *Shrader v. Astrue*, No. 11-13000, 2012 WL 5383120, at *6 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 1, 2012)
- *Smith-Johnson v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 579 F. App'x 426, 432-33 (6th Cir. 2014)
- *Kent v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 142 F. Supp. 3d 643, 650 (S.D. Ohio 2015)
- *Vega v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 1:23-cv-956, 2024 WL 5400280, at *10 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 22, 2024)
- *Edwards v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:22-cv-597, 2023 WL 2988373, at *13 (N.D. Ohio Mar. 10, 2023)
- *Hammer v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 3:25-cv-1119, 2026 WL 177678, at *7 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 22, 2026)
- *Greene ex rel. Greene v. Astrue*, No. 1:10-cv-0414, 2010 WL 5021033, at *4 (N.D. Ohio Dec. 3, 2010)
- *McPherson v. Kelsey*, 125 F.3d 989, 995-96 (6th Cir. 1997)
- *Butcher v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 1:20-cv-1230, 2021 WL 1878120, at *15 (N.D. Ohio May 3, 2021)
- *Duncan v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 801 F.2d 847, 856 (6th Cir. 1986)
- *Moats v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, *Moats v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 42 F.4th 558, 563 (6th Cir. 2022)

- *Stevenson v. Kijakazi*, No. 5:20-cv-2688, 2022 WL 4551590, at *13 (N.D. Ohio Sept. 29, 2022)
- *Drummond v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 126 F.3d 837, 842 (6th Cir. 1997)
- *Kirchbaum v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 1:24-cv-381, 2024 WL 3992276, at *5, *7 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 29, 2024)
- *Lewis v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 1:09-cv-2450, 2011 WL 334850, at *6 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 31, 2011)
- *Elledge v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 1:23-cv-1979, 2024 WL 3237455, at *6 (N.D. Ohio Apr. 9, 2024)
- *White v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 572 F.3d 272, 284 (6th Cir. 2009)
- *DeLong v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 748 F.3d 723, 726 (6th Cir. 2014)
- *Cross o/b/o K.C. v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 5:20-cv-2787, 2022 WL 574260, at *5 (N.D. Ohio Feb. 25, 2022)
- *Kinney v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 23-3889, 2024 WL 2273365, at *3-4 (6th Cir. May 20, 2024)
- *Reeves v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, 618 F. App'x 267, 275 (6th Cir. 2015)
- *Wilds v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec.*, No. 24-5504, 2025 WL 1001806, at *5 (6th Cir. Mar. 31, 2025)
- *Berkshire v. Dahl*, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019)