

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

James Robert Hall v. Commissioner of Social Security

James Robert Hall v. Commissioner of Social Security · No. 1:25-CV-01147 · Decided February 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio adopted the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation without objection. The court affirmed the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of James Robert Hall’s claims for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income, concluding that the Administrative Law Judge properly evaluated his impairments, symptoms, and residual functional capacity and that substantial evidence supported the decision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Donald C. Nugent
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	February 4, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-CV-01147
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a Social Security claimant's objections-free challenge to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation concerning the Commissioner's denial of benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviewed the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation de novo and affirmed the Commissioner's decision because it was supported by substantial evidence and applied the applicable Social Security rulings.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	James Robert Hall v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- agency adjudication
- administrative law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

administrative law

social security disability

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the ALJ properly applied Social Security Ruling 96-8p in considering Hall's impairments and limitations when determining his residual functional capacity.
2. Whether the ALJ properly evaluated Hall's symptoms under Social Security Ruling 16-3p.
3. Whether substantial evidence supported the ALJ's finding that Hall could perform light work with specified limitations.
4. Whether the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation should be adopted and the Commissioner's denial of benefits affirmed.

HOLDINGS

1. The ALJ properly considered Hall's impairments and related limitations when formulating the residual functional capacity determination, and substantial evidence supported that determination.
2. The ALJ evaluated Hall's symptom allegations in accordance with SSR 16-3p, and substantial evidence supported the ALJ's conclusions.
3. Substantial evidence supported the ALJ's finding that Hall retained the residual functional capacity to perform light work with specified limitations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“the ALJ’s decision properly applied SSR 96-8p, as it indicated that he considered all of Mr.-Hall’s impairments in crafting the residual functioning capacity determination, and that substantial evidence supported the ALJ’s decision” (ECF No. 14 at 10-11)

“the ALJ’s decision considered Mr. Hall’s symptom allegations in accordance with SSR 16-3p, and that substantial evidence supports the ALJ’s conclusions” (ECF No. 14 at 13-14)

“the ALJ’s decision considered all of Mr. Hall’s impairments in formulating the residual functional capacity determination, and that substantial evidence supported the ALJ’s decision” (ECF No. 14 at 15)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hall sought Disability Insurance Benefits under the Social Security Act. Although the ALJ found that Hall had several severe impairments, the ALJ concluded that none met or medically equaled a listed impairment and that Hall retained the residual functional capacity to perform light work subject to specified limitations. Hall challenged the ALJ's consideration of his impairments, symptoms, and ability to perform light work, but the magistrate judge found that the ALJ properly applied the governing standards and that substantial evidence supported the decision.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hall applied for Disability Insurance Benefits on April 3, 2022. The application was denied initially and on reconsideration; following a February 14, 2024 hearing, the ALJ issued a decision on March 13, 2024, finding Hall not disabled and capable of performing light work with limitations. The Appeals Council declined review on April 7, 2025. Hall then filed this action, and the magistrate judge recommended affirmance. Because Hall filed no objections, the district court reviewed the Report and Recommendation de novo and adopted it in full.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Ohio Citizen Action v. City of Seven Hills, 35 F. Supp. 2d 575, 577 (N.D. Ohio 1999)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION JAMES ROBERT HALL, | CASE NO. 1:25-CV-01147. Plaintiff,) JUDGE
DONALD C. NUGENT COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE ☐
SECURITY, JUDGE’S REPORT AND. -) RECOMMENDATION. Defendant..) This matter
comes before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Carmen E.
Henderson.

The Report and Recommendation (ECF #14), issued on January 5, 2026, is hereby ADOPTED by this Court, without objection. On June 3, 2025, Plaintiff James Robert Hall filed a Complaint in this Court (ECF #1) ☐ challenging the final decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, which decision denied his application for benefits under the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 423 et seq.

(ECF #7, PageID #322-#332).¹ The Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) determined that, Plaintiff (also referred to as “Claimant”) filed his application for Disability Insurance Benefits on April 3, 2022. (ECF #7, PageID #322).

The application was denied initially and upon reconsideration, and he thereafter requested a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge. On February 14, 2024, the hearing was held. (ECF #7, PageID #337-#363). On March 13, 2024, the Administrative Law Judge issued a written decision finding that Plaintiff/Claimant Hall was while Plaintiff/Claimant Hall had a number of severe impairments, “the claimant [Hall] does not have an impairment or combination of impairments that meet or medically equals the severity of one of the listed impairments in 20 CFR Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1 (20 CFR 404.1520(d), 404.1525, and 404.1526),” and that “the claimant [Hall] has the residual functional capacity to perform light work as defined in 20 CFR 404.1567(b),” within certain specified limitations as set forth in the ALJ ‘5 decision.

(ECF #7, PageID 4324-4327). oe. Plaintiff/Claimant Mr. Hall claims that the ALJ in his decision: (1) did not properly apply the criteria of Social Security Ruling (“SSR”) 96-8p in considering all of his impairments and related limitations when forming his residual functional capacity evaluation; (2) failed to comply with SSR 16-3p in evaluating the totality of his symptoms; and (3) erred in finding that Mr. Hall could perform work at the light level of exertion, arguing that such finding was not supported by substantial evidence.

(ECF #10, p.1, PageID #2070).. The Magistrate Judge to whom this matter was referred pursuant to N.D. Ohio L.R. 3.1 (See Non-Numbered Docket Entry accompanying ECF #1), Magistrate Judge Carmen □ Henderson, found that: (1) the ALJ’s decision properly applied SSR 96-8p, as it indicated that he considered all of Mr.-Hall’s impairments in crafting the residual functioning capacity determination, and that substantial evidence supported the ALJ’s decision (ECF #14, pp. 10-11, PageID #2122-#2123); (2) the ALJ’s decision considered Mr. Hall’s symptom allegations in accordance with SSR 16-3p, and that substantial evidence supports the ALJ’s conclusions (ECF #14, pp.13-14, PageID #2125-#2126); and (3) the ALJ’s decision considered all of Mr. Hall’s not disabled.

(ECF #7, PageID #322-#332). That decision became final on April 7, 2025, when the Appeals Council declined further review. (ECF #7, PageID #28-#31). -2- impairments in formulating the residual functional capacity determination, and that substantial evidence supported the ALJ’s decision (ECF #14, p. 15, PageID #2127). Based on a full review of the arguments presented, the applicable law, and the record before the Court, Magistrate Judge Henderson’s Report and Recommendation (ECF #14) recommends that the Court overrule Plaintiff/Claimant Hall’s “Legal Claims” set forth as his statement of errors as found on the opening page of his brief challenging the ALJ’s decision, and to affirm the Commissioner of Social Security’s decision as reflected in the ALJ’s ruling.

Mr. Hall has not since filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge’s January 5, 2026 Report and Recommendation. The Court has reviewed de novo the Report and Recommendation, see *Ohio Citizen Action v. City of Seven Hills*, 35 F. Supp. 2d 575, 577 (N.D. Ohio 1999), and ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

The Commissioner’s decision denying Mr. Hall’s Disability Insurance and Supplemental Social Security Income is AFFIRMED. IT IS SO ORDERED. DONALD C. df | United States District Judge DATED: Shas 4 01 b -3-