

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION

Wright v. Bisignano

No. 4:23-cv-01360-MTS · No. 4:23-cv-01360-MTS · Decided February 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denies Vickie Wright’s motion for an extension of time to comply with an order requiring information concerning her Social Security appeal. The court concludes that she failed to demonstrate excusable neglect and that an extension would be futile because the challenged administrative decision had already been affirmed by the court and the Eighth Circuit, precluding relitigation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	February 2, 2026
DOCKET	4:23-cv-01360-MTS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for an extension of time after the court dismissed the action without prejudice for failure to comply with an order and failure to prosecute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion to extend a deadline under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) requires good cause and excusable neglect when filed after the deadline; the court also considered whether the requested extension would be futile.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Vickie Wright v. Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- res judicata
- administrative law

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Wright established good cause and excusable neglect warranting an extension of time under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b).
2. Whether an extension should be denied as futile because Wright's apparent challenge to the 2021 Social Security decision was barred by prior litigation.

HOLDINGS

1. The court denied Wright's motion for an extension because she failed to establish excusable neglect for missing the court-ordered deadline.
2. Even assuming Wright had shown excusable neglect, the court would deny the extension because the limited information she provided showed that she was attempting to challenge a decision already affirmed in prior litigation and therefore could not relitigate its propriety in this action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because that decision was affirmed by both this Court and the Eighth Circuit in a prior action, the propriety of ALJ Barber’s decision “was finally decided in that litigation, and [Plaintiff] is precluded from relitigating it here.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Wright sought to challenge an adverse Social Security decision issued by Administrative Law Judge Robin J. Barber on May 3, 2021. That decision had previously been affirmed by the Eastern District of Missouri and the Eighth Circuit. After the court ordered Wright to provide information clarifying whether her present action challenged the same decision and whether the action was timely, she failed to comply by the deadline. She later sought an extension based on neuropathy in her fingers and delayed receipt of documents.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously denied the Commissioner's motion to dismiss without prejudice and ordered Wright to provide information concerning the Social Security decision she sought to challenge, including the relevant Appeals Council correspondence. Wright did not timely comply, and the court dismissed the action without prejudice on January 5, 2026. Wright then moved for additional time, asserting finger neuropathy and delayed receipt of documents. The court denied the motion, concluding that she had not shown excusable neglect and that an extension would be futile because her apparent challenge was barred by prior litigation.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wright v. Kijakazi, 4:21-cv-0792-ACL, 2022 WL 4760493, at *1, 13 (E.D. Mo. Oct. 3, 2022)
- Wright v. Kijakazi, 22-3124, 2023 WL 3015226 (8th Cir. Apr. 20, 2023)
- Stephen Gould Corp. v. Buckeye Int'l, Inc., 4:22-cv-00771-MTS, 2025 WL 1100027, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Apr. 14, 2025)
- Chorosevic v. MetLife Choices, 600 F.3d 934, 946 (8th Cir. 2010)
- Rubenstein v. Am. Acad. of Actuaries, 1:23-cv-00096, 2023 WL 4568506, at *5 (E.D. Tenn. July 17, 2023)
- Cottrell v. Sullivan, 987 F.2d 342, 344 (6th Cir. 1992)
- Nevada v. United States, 463 U.S. 110, 130 (1983)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-mis/2026/wright-v-bisignano-arj89ea0>