

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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/moore-v-commissioner-of-social-security-3psv2atv>