

**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.

OPINION

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