

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Hoyos Mendoza v. Dudek

Hoyos Mendoza · No. 25-cv-365-DDL · Decided March 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The court grants Plaintiff Analaura H.M.’s application to proceed in forma pauperis in her action seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. The court also finds that the complaint satisfies the pleading requirements under the Supplemental Rules for Social Security Actions, states a plausible claim, and survives screening.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	March 3, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-365-DDL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed an action seeking judicial review of a final adverse Social Security decision and concurrently applied to proceed in forma pauperis. The court considered the application and screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For an in forma pauperis application, the court determines whether the applicant is unable to pay the filing fee and whether the complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted. Upon granting IFP status, the court screens the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (B) for failure to state a claim, frivolousness, maliciousness, or claims seeking monetary relief from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation or stated precedential designation.
PARTIES	Analaura H.M., Hoyos Mendoza v. Leland Dudek, Acting Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- administrative law
- judicial review of agency action
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

Social Security

administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff demonstrated that she was unable to pay the civil filing fee and therefore qualified to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Whether Plaintiff's Social Security complaint satisfied the pleading requirements of Rule 2 of the Supplemental Rules for Social Security Actions and survived screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff adequately demonstrated that she lacked the financial resources to pay the civil filing fee and was entitled to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. The complaint satisfied the applicable Supplemental Rules for Social Security Actions, stated a plausible claim for relief, and was neither frivolous nor malicious; therefore, the action could proceed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“An affidavit in support of an IFP application is sufficient where it alleges that the affiant cannot pay the court costs and still afford the necessities of life.” (at 1)

“Where the Court grants a litigant permission to proceed IFP, it must also screen the complaint pursuant to Title 28, Section 1915(e)(2)(B) of the United States Code.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff stated that she was unemployed, had last worked in April 2020, and had no income apart from \$650 per month in disability payments through CALPERS. She reported an outstanding \$20,000 car loan, owned a 2018 Chevy Colorado, rented a room with her daughter, and contributed her entire monthly CALPERS payment to rent. The court found that these circumstances demonstrated an inability to pay the filing fee. The complaint sought review of a final adverse decision of the Commissioner of Social Security and satisfied the applicable pleading requirements.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On February 19, 2025, Plaintiff filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3), together with an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court granted the application after finding that Plaintiff lacked sufficient financial resources to pay the filing fee. The court screened the complaint, found that it satisfied the Supplemental Rules for Social Security Actions, stated a plausible claim, and allowed the action to proceed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127 (9th Cir. 200)
- Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339-40 (1948)
- Escobedo v. Applebees, 787 F.3d 1226, 1235 (9th Cir. 2015)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-fo/2025/hoyos-mendoza-v-dudek-ee47h3n7>