

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Hannah Story v. Commissioner of Social Security

No. 1:25-cv-01176-JLT-SAB, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (January 9, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders Plaintiff Hannah Story to show cause within seven days why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to file an opening brief in a Social Security disability benefits action. The order states that the opening brief was due January 8, 2026, and warns that failure to respond will result in sanctions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 9, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01176-JLT-SAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Social Security disability claimant filed an action seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision. After the administrative record was lodged and the deadline for Plaintiff's opening brief passed without a brief or extension request, the court issued an order to show cause regarding sanctions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; procedural show-cause order
PARTIES	Hannah Story v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure
- administrative law

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security
- federal civil procedure
- sanctions
- administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's failure to file the opening brief or request an extension violated the court's scheduling order.
2. Whether the court should require Plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for that failure.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's failure to timely file the opening brief or seek an extension constituted a failure to comply with the court's scheduling order.
2. The court may require Plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failure to comply with the scheduling order, and warned that failure to comply with the show-cause order would result in sanctions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” (1)

“Plaintiff's failure to timely file the opening brief, or seek an extension to do so, constitutes a failure to comply with the Court's order.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brought the action to obtain judicial review of a final decision denying an application for disability benefits under the Social Security Act. Under the scheduling order, Plaintiff's opening brief was due thirty days after the administrative record was filed. The record was lodged on December 9, 2025, making the brief due January 8, 2026, but Plaintiff did not file the brief or seek an extension.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on September 11, 2025. The court issued a scheduling order on September 12, 2025, and the administrative record was lodged on December 9, 2025. Plaintiff's opening brief was due January 8, 2026, but Plaintiff neither filed the brief nor requested an extension. The court ordered Plaintiff to show cause within seven days why sanctions should not be imposed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000)

OPINION

Hannah Story v. Commissioner of Social Security

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 HANNAH STORY, Case No. 1:25-cv-01176-JLT-SAB 11 Plaintiff, ORDER REQUIRING
PLAINTIFF TO

SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS

12 v. SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR

FAILURE TO FILE OPENING BRIEF

13 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

SEVEN-DAY DEADLINE

14 Defendant. 15

16 On September 11, 2025, Plaintiff filed this action seeking judicial review of a final 17 decision
of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying an application for 18 disability
benefits pursuant to the Social Security Act. (ECF No. 1.) On September 12, 2025, 19 the Court
issued a scheduling order. (ECF No. 5.) Pursuant to the scheduling order, Plaintiff’s 20 opening
brief was due 30 days after the filing of the administrative record. (Id. at 2.) The 21 administrative
record was lodged on December 9, 2025 (ECF No. 12), and thus, Plaintiff’s 22 opening brief was
due by January 8, 2026. However, neither an opening brief nor request for 23 extension of time
has been submitted. 24 Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply
with these 25 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of
any and all 26 sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent
power to 27 control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where
appropriate, including dismissal of the action. *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841
(9th Cir. 1 | 2000). 2 Plaintiff’s failure to timely file the opening brief, or seek an extension to do
so, 3 | constitutes a failure to comply with the Court’s order. Accordingly, Plaintiff will be directed
to 4 | show cause why sanctions should not issue for failure to file the opening brief in compliance
5 | with the Court’s September 12, 2025 scheduling order. 6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS
HEREBY ORDERED that within seven (7) days of entry 7 | of this order, Plaintiff shall show
cause in writing why sanctions should not issue for the failure 8 | to comply with the Court’s
scheduling order (ECF No. 5). Plaintiff is advised that filing an 9 | opening brief without showing
cause in writing why sanctions should not issue is an insufficient 10 | response _to this order.
Failure to comply with this order will result in the imposition of 11 | sanctions. 12

3 IT IS SO ORDERED. FA. Se

14 | Dated: _ January 9, 2026

STANLEY A. BOONE

15 United States Magistrate Judge 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2026/hannah-story-v-commissioner-of-social-security-5rak1mg0>