

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA**

**Arwood v. Bisignano**

No. 1:25-cv-00736-SKO, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (June 20, 2025)

---

**OPINION**

(SS) Arwood 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 BRANDI ARWOOD, on behalf of her Case No. 1:25-cv-00736-SKO minor child D.D.J.

12 ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO FILE

Plaintiff, NOTICE OF ADEQUATE

13 REPRESENTATION OR APPLICATION FOR

v. APPOINTMENT OF GUARDIAN AD LITEM

14 FOR MINOR PLAINTIFF PURSUANT TO

FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner of LOCAL RULE 202(a) 15 Social Security,

FOURTEEN DAY DEADLINE

16 Defendant. 17

18 Plaintiff Brandi Arwood, on behalf of minor D.D.J., (“Plaintiff”) filed a complaint on June 19  
18, 2025, challenging a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying an 20  
application for disability benefits. (Doc. 1.) Plaintiff did not pay the filing fee in this action and 21  
instead filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (Doc. 2.)  
22 On June 20, 2025, the Court granted the application to proceed in forma pauperis. (Doc. 3.)  
23 Rule 17 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that a suit by a minor may be  
24 brought or defended by “(A) a general guardian; (B) a committee; (C) a conservator; or (D) a  
like 25 fiduciary.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 17(c)(1). Thus, Rule 17(c)(1)(A) permits a “general guardian” to  
sue 26 in federal court on behalf of a minor, and “[a] parent is a guardian who may so sue.” Doe  
ex rel. 27 Sisco v. Weed Union Elementary Sch. Dist., No. 2:13-CV-01145-GEB, 2013 WL  
2666024, at \*1 28 (E.D. Cal. June 12, 2013) (denying a motion to appoint a guardian ad litem as  
unnecessary because 1 nothing in the complaint indicated the minor plaintiff’s parents would not  
adequately protect her 2 interests, nor was there evidence of a conflict of interest between the  
minor plaintiff and her 3 parents); see also Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. v. Remington, No. 2:12-cv-  
02821-GEB-CMK, 2013 4 WL 3070629, \*2 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2013) (finding no need to appoint  
parent guardian ad litem of 5 defendant minor where nothing in the record suggested she had a

conflict or would not protect the 6 minor's interests). The Local Rules of the Eastern District of California provide that: 7 Upon commencement of an action or upon initial appearance in defense of an action by or on behalf of a minor or incompetent 8 person, the attorney representing the minor or incompetent person shall present (1) appropriate evidence of the appointment of a 9 representative for the minor or incompetent person under state law or (2) a motion for the appointment of a guardian ad litem by the 10 Court, or, (3) a showing satisfactory to the Court that no such appointment is necessary to ensure adequate representation of the 11 minor or incompetent person. 12 E.D. Cal. L.R. 202(a) (emphasis added). 13 Here, the complaint indicates that this action was initiated by a parent of the minor Plaintiff. 14 (See Doc. 1 at 1.) Thus, Plaintiff is required to present a showing satisfactory to the Court that no 15 appointment of a guardian ad litem is necessary to ensure adequate representation of the minor, or, 16 if necessary, file a motion for the appointment of a guardian ad litem. However, upon review of 17 the docket, no notice of adequate representation nor application for the appointment of guardian ad 18 litem has been filed. 19 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within FOURTEEN (14) DAYS from the 20 date of entry of this order, Plaintiff shall present a showing satisfactory to the Court that no 21 appointment of a guardian ad litem is necessary to ensure adequate representation of the minor or 22 file a motion for the appointment of a guardian ad litem that meets the requirements of Local Rule 23 202(a). 24 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 26 Dated: June 20, 2025 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto .

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

27 28