

**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

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-