

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, FORT WAYNE DIVISION

LaVonya Jeanette Moore v. Commissioner of Social Security

Moore · No. 1:25-cv-00485-ALT · Decided May 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana affirmed the Commissioner's decision denying LaVonya Jeanette Moore Disability Insurance Benefits and a period of disability. The court held that Moore's pro se filings did not present a developed legal argument challenging the Administrative Law Judge's reasoning, substantial-evidence support, or application of the governing legal standard. The court directed the Clerk to enter judgment for the Commissioner.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Andrew L. Teel
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne Division
DECIDED	May 20, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00485-ALT
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se appeal to the district court from the Commissioner's final decision denying Disability Insurance Benefits and a period of disability.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Commissioner's decision must be affirmed where the claimant does not show that the ALJ's decision lacks substantial-evidence support or applies an incorrect legal standard.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court opinion; precedential status not specified.
PARTIES	LaVonya Jeanette Moore v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- administrative law
- pleadings
- waiver
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

administrative law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Moore was entitled to reversal or remand of the Commissioner's decision when her briefs presented no developed legal argument identifying error in the ALJ's reasoning, lack of substantial-evidence support, or application of an incorrect legal standard.
2. Whether the district court should involve itself in Moore's alleged secret settlement or class-action claim.

HOLDINGS

1. A pro se claimant must still present developed legal arguments explaining why the Commissioner's decision should be reversed; undeveloped arguments are waived. Because Moore presented no legal argument challenging the ALJ's decision, the court was required to affirm.
2. The court would not involve itself in Moore's alleged secret settlement, and her claimed entitlement to money from a class action was irrelevant to the Social Security appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Judges are not required to construct a party's legal arguments for him."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Commissioner denied Moore's application for Disability Insurance Benefits and a period of disability. In her district-court filings, Moore did not identify a specific error in the ALJ's reasoning, argue that the decision lacked substantial-evidence support, or contend that the ALJ applied the wrong legal standard. Moore also referred to a purported secret settlement and a class action from which she claimed entitlement to money.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Moore sought judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision under the Social Security Act. After Moore filed an opening brief and reply, and the Commissioner responded, the court concluded that Moore presented no developed legal argument challenging the ALJ's reasoning, substantial-evidence support, or legal standard, and affirmed the Commissioner's decision.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Jennifer N. v. Saul, No. 3:18-CV-811-JVB, 2020 WL 4333758, at *3 (N.D. Ind. July 28, 2020)
- Woods v. Colvin, No. 3:14-CV-02020-CAN, 2015 WL 9076997, at *2 (N.D. Ind. Dec. 16, 2015)
- Border v. Crystal Lake, 75 F.3d 270, 274 (7th Cir. 1996)

OPINION

Moore

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

FORT WAYNE DIVISION

LAVONYA JEANETTE MOORE,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Cause No. 1:25-cv-00485-ALT)

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL)

SECURITY,)

) Defendant.)

OPINION AND ORDER

Pro se Plaintiff LaVonya Jeanette Moore appeals to the district court from a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying her application under the Social Security Act (the “Act”) for Disability Insurance Benefits (DIB) and a period of disability. (ECF 1). Moore filed her opening brief on February 25, 2026, and the Commissioner filed a response in opposition on April 8, 2026. (ECF 20, 24). Moore filed her reply on April 15, 2026. (ECF 26). Therefore, the case is ripe for ruling. In her briefs, Plaintiff does not identify any error in the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”)’s reasoning or identify any part of the decision that is not supported by substantial evidence or that the ALJ applied the wrong legal standard. As a pro se litigant, the Court construes Plaintiff’s filings liberally, but she must still present legal arguments as to why she is entitled to relief. *Jennifer N. v. Saul*, No. 3:18-CV-811-JVB, 2020 WL 4333758, at *3 (N.D. Ind. July 28, 2020). Underdeveloped arguments, including those by pro se plaintiffs, are considered waived. *Woods v. Colvin*, No. 3:14-CV-02020-CAN, 2015 WL 9076997, at *2 (N.D. Ind. Dec. 16, 2015) (citing *Border v. Crystal Lake*, 75 F.3d 270, 274 (7th Cir. 1996)). Pro se plaintiffs must present a legal argument with supporting authority. (*Id.*). “Judges are not required to construct a party’s legal arguments for him.” *Woods*, 2015 WL 9076997, at *2 (citation and quotation marks omitted). In this case, Plaintiff advances no legal arguments. There is a section where Plaintiff lists various legal principles and uses buzzwords such as venue and summary judgment, but she advances no argument nor applies any legal concept to the facts at hand. (See ECF 26 at 8-9). She claims the Social Security Administration can reopen a case at any time and reverse the decision, which is of course untrue. (*Id.*). In all her pages of filings submitted to the Court, Plaintiff does not argue that the ALJ’s decision is not supported by substantial evidence or that the ALJ applied the wrong legal standard. The Court must affirm the Commissioner’s decision. Plaintiff again asks for a “secret settlement” (ECF 20 at 2-3) and mentions a class action lawsuit that she says she is entitled to money from (ECF 26 at 4). As stated in this Court’s prior orders, the Court will not involve itself in any alleged settlement. (ECF 19, 22). As to the class action lawsuit, this is irrelevant to this social security appeal, as Plaintiff was informed in a prior

order. (ECF 19). For the foregoing reasons, the Commissioner's decision is AFFIRMED. The Clerk is DIRECTED to enter a judgment in favor of the Commissioner and against Moore. SO ORDERED. Entered this 20th day of May 2026. /s/ Andrew L. Teel Andrew L. Teel United States Magistrate Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-indiana-fort-wayne-division-united-states/2026/lavonya-jeanette-moore-v-commissioner-of-social-security-0vt0dzbo>