

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

Tara L. Danoff v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration

No. 1:25-CV-01769-CEH (N.D. Ohio Feb. 19, 2026) · No. 1:25-CV-01769-CEH · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio reviewed the Commissioner of Social Security’s partially favorable decision concerning Tara L. Danoff’s applications for SSI and DIB. The court held that the ALJ failed to build a logical bridge supporting the finding of medical improvement and the resulting change in residual functional capacity. The court reversed the nondisability finding and remanded the case under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Carmen E. Henderson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-CV-01769-CEH
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Judicial review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Commissioner's final decision ending Danoff's disability benefits after finding medical improvement.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviews whether the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence and was made under proper legal standards. The court may not uphold the decision when the ALJ's stated reasons fail to build an accurate and logical bridge between the evidence and the result.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum opinion; persuasive authority only
PARTIES	Tara L. Danoff v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration

TOPICS

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ's finding that Danoff experienced medical improvement as of March 5, 2024 was supported by substantial evidence.
2. Whether the ALJ adequately explained how the cited medical evidence supported increased abilities to reach, handle, finger, and feel with Danoff's left upper extremity.
3. Whether the ALJ built an accurate and logical bridge between the evidence and the conclusion that Danoff's disability ended.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ failed to build a logical bridge between the evidence and the conclusion that Danoff experienced medical improvement as of March 5, 2024.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"It defies logic to conclude that objective medical findings that supported a finding of disability for one period somehow also support a finding of medical improvement less than a year later." (PageID #: 57)

"Overall, the ALJ failed to build a logical bridge between the evidence and her conclusion that Plaintiff experienced medical improvement as of March 5, 2024." (PageID #: 57)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Danoff has cerebral palsy with left-sided dystonia, spasticity, gait impairment, and left shoulder, wrist, hand, and finger limitations. The ALJ found her disabled through March 4, 2024, based in part on limitations preventing use of the nondominant left upper extremity for reaching, handling, fingering, and feeling. The ALJ later relied on improved shoulder range of motion and strength, Botox treatment, and other treatment notes to find medical improvement and permit occasional use of the left upper extremity. The court concluded that the cited later records contained findings identical to findings previously relied on to establish disability and did not explain improvement in handling, fingering, and feeling.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Danoff applied for DIB and SSI, alleging disability beginning January 1, 2023. The ALJ found her disabled from January 1, 2023 through March 4, 2024, but found that medical improvement ended her disability beginning March 5, 2024; the Appeals Council denied review on July 7, 2025. Danoff filed this action, and the parties briefed whether the ALJ's medical-improvement finding was supported by substantial evidence and adequately explained.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Remand to the Commissioner and the ALJ under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further proceedings addressing the evidence of medical improvement and the relationship between any improvement and Danoff's limitations in reaching, handling, fingering, and feeling.

CASES CITED

- Winn v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 615 F. App'x 315, 320 (6th Cir.)
- Rogers v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 486 F.3d 234, 241 (6th Cir.)
- Cutlip v. Sec'y of HHS, 25 F.3d 284, 286 (6th Cir.)
- Olive v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., No. 3:06 CV 1597, 2007 WL 5403416, at *2 (N.D. Ohio Sept. 19, 2007)
- Abbott v. Sullivan, 905 F.2d 918, 922 (6th Cir.)
- Mullen v. Bowen, 800 F.2d 535, 538 (6th Cir.) (en banc)
- Kinsella v. Schweiker, 708 F.2d 1058, 1059-60 (6th Cir.)
- Combs v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 459 F.3d 640, 642-43 (6th Cir.)
- Walters v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec., 127 F.3d 525, 529 (6th Cir.)
- Fleischer v. Astrue, 774 F. Supp. 2d 875, 877, 881 (N.D. Ohio)