

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)