

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Moore v. Commissioner of Social Security

Moore · No. 1:25-cv-01078-CDB (SS) · Decided September 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Richard Moore’s application to proceed in forma pauperis in an action seeking review of the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of disability benefits. The court finds that the complaint states a cognizable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and was timely filed. The court directs the Clerk to issue a summons, scheduling order, and consent or reassignment documents.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 3, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01078-CDB (SS)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed an action seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying Social Security disability benefits and applied to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the application, determined that the complaint stated a cognizable and timely claim, and directed issuance of the summons and related case-management documents.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	At the in forma pauperis screening stage, the court must dismiss a complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true for pleading purposes and determines whether they state a facially plausible claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court order with no reporter citation.

TOPICS

- judicial review of agency action
- pleadings
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure
- administrative law

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security

civil procedure

administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff satisfied the statutory requirements to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Whether the complaint stated a cognizable, timely claim for judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
3. Whether the Clerk should issue the summons and initial case-management and reassignment documents.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff satisfied the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) and may commence the action without prepayment of the filing fee.
2. The complaint states a cognizable and timely claim for review of the Commissioner's final decision denying Social Security benefits.
3. The Clerk must issue a summons, scheduling order, order regarding consent or reassignment, and consent-to-assignment or reassignment form.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court may authorize the commencement of an action without prepayment of fees “by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such [person] possesses [and] that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor.”” (at 1)

“A claim is frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them.”” (at 1)

“a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Appeals Council denied Plaintiff's request for review of an Administrative Law Judge's decision denying his claim for Social Security benefits on April 29, 2025. The Appeals Council later granted Plaintiff a thirty-day extension to file an action for judicial review. Plaintiff, who alleged that he resides in Fresno County, filed this action on August 27, 2025 and sought to proceed without paying the filing fee.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Richard Moore filed the complaint on August 27, 2025, challenging the Commissioner's denial of disability insurance benefits and supplemental income. The Appeals Council had denied review on April 29, 2025, but granted a thirty-day extension to seek judicial review; Moore filed within that extended period. The court granted in forma pauperis status and ordered the Clerk to issue a summons, scheduling order, and consent or reassignment documents.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992)
- Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)
- Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2 266, 268 (9th Cir.)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 556, 570 (2007)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)

OPINION

(SS) Moore v. Commissioner of Social Security

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 RICHARD MOORE, Case No. 1:25-cv-01078-CDB (SS) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
GRANTING APPLICATION TO

PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND

13 v. DIRECTING CLERK OF THE COURT TO

ISSUE SUMMONS, SCHEDULING ORDER,

14 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL AND CONSENT OR REQUEST FOR
SECURITY, REASSIGNMENT DOCUMENTS

15 Defendant. (Doc. 2) 16 17 18 Plaintiff Richard Moore (“Plaintiff”) initiated this action with the
filing of a complaint on

19 August 27, 2025, seeking review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security
20 denying disability insurance and benefits. (Doc. 1). Plaintiff did not pay the filing fee and
instead 21 filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

(Doc. 2). 22 For the following reasons, the Court finds issuance of the new case documents and
Plaintiff’s 23 application to proceed in forma pauperis appropriate. 24 I. Proceeding In Forma

Pauperis 25 The Court may authorize the commencement of an action without prepayment of fees
“by 26 a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such [person]
possesses 27 [and] that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor.” 28 U.S.C. §

1915(a). Here, the Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s application and financial status affidavit (Doc. 2)
and finds 1 the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) are satisfied. 2 II. Screening Requirement 3

When a party seeks to proceed in forma pauperis, the Court is required to review the 4 complaint

and shall dismiss the complaint, or portion thereof, if it is “frivolous, malicious or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or ... seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(b) & (e)(2). A plaintiff’s claim is frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992).

III. Pleading Standards

A complaint must include a statement affirming the court’s jurisdiction, “a short and plain statement of the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief; and a demand for the relief sought, which may include relief in the alternative or different types of relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The purpose of the complaint is to give the defendant fair notice of the claims, and the grounds upon which the complaint stands. *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002). As set forth by the Supreme Court, Rule 8: ... does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. A pleading that offers labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do. Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertions devoid of further factual enhancement. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Vague and conclusory allegations do not support a cause of action. *Ivey v. Board of Regents*, 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). The *Iqbal* Court clarified further, [A] complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2009). A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.* at 556. The plausibility standard is not akin to a “probability requirement,” but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully. *Id.* Where a complaint pleads facts that are “merely consistent with” a defendant’s liability, it “stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of ‘entitlement to relief.’” and determine whether the facts would make the plaintiff entitled to relief; legal conclusions are not entitled to the same assumption of truth. *Id.* The Court may grant leave to amend a complaint to the extent deficiencies of the complaint can be cured by an amendment. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc).

IV. Discussion and Analysis

Plaintiff seeks review of a decision by the Commissioner of Social Security denying disability benefits. (Doc. 1). The Court may have jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), which provides: Any individual after any final decision of the Commissioner made after a hearing to which he was a party, irrespective of the amount in controversy, may obtain a review of such decision by a civil action commenced within sixty days after the mailing to him of such decision or within such further time as the Commissioner may allow. Such action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the plaintiff resides or has his principal place of business...The court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript of the record, a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision

of the Commissioner 14 of Social Security, with or without remanding the cause for a rehearing.
15 16 Id. Except as provided by statute, “[n]o findings of fact or decision of the Commissioner
shall be 17 reviewed by any person, tribunal, or governmental agency.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(h). 18 On
April 29, 2025, the Appeals Council denied Plaintiff’s request for review of the decision 19 of the
Administrative Law Judge denying Plaintiff’s claim for benefits. (Doc. 1 ¶ 8). On August 20 4,
2025, the Appeals Council granted Plaintiff an extension of time of 30 days from the date of the 21
notice to file an appeal for judicial review of the Commissioner’s final decision in federal district
22 court. Id. ¶ 9. On August 27, 2025, Plaintiff filed a complaint in this Court seeking judicial
review 23 of the Commissioner’s final decision. See id. Thus, Plaintiff’s complaint is timely.
Plaintiff claims 24 residency in Fresno County, California. Id. ¶ 1. Therefore, the Court has
jurisdiction over this 25 action. 26 /// 27 /// 1} V. Conclusion and Order 2 Plaintiff's complaint
states a cognizable claim for review of the administrative decision 3 | denying Social Security
benefits and supplemental income. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY 4 | ORDERED that Plaintiff's
application to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 2) is GRANTED. The 5 | Clerk of Court is directed
to issue the following: 1) a Summons; 2) the Scheduling Order; 3) the 6 | Order re Consent or
Request for Reassignment; and 4) a Consent to Assignment or Request for 7 | Reassignment form.
8 | IT IS SO ORDERED. ” | Dated: _ September 3, 2025 | hr
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28