

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jesus Sales v. Commissioner of Social Security

No. 1:25-cv-00847-CDB (SS) (E.D. Cal. July 15, 2025) · No. 1:25-cv-00847-CDB (SS) · Decided July 15, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Jesus Sales’s application to proceed in forma pauperis in an action seeking review of the Commissioner of Social Security’s denial of disability benefits. The court finds the complaint timely and cognizable under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and directs the Clerk to issue a summons, scheduling order, and consent or reassignment documents.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 15, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00847-CDB (SS)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed an action seeking judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision denying disability benefits and supplemental income, together with an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the application, found the complaint cognizable and timely, determined that it had jurisdiction, and directed issuance of case-opening and scheduling documents.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	At the screening stage under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(b) and (e)(2), the court reviews an in forma pauperis complaint and must dismiss it if it is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. For pleading sufficiency, the complaint must satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and contain sufficient factual matter to state a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; limited persuasive value
PARTIES	Jesus Sales v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

judicial review of agency action

administrative law

pleadings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Social Security law

administrative law

civil procedure

in forma pauperis proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff satisfied the requirements to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).
2. Whether Plaintiff's complaint stated a cognizable and timely claim for judicial review of the Commissioner's final decision under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
3. Whether the court had jurisdiction over the action based on Plaintiff's residence and the alleged final administrative decision.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff satisfied the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), and the application to proceed in forma pauperis was granted.
2. The complaint stated a cognizable claim for review of the administrative decision and was not dismissed under the in forma pauperis screening requirements.
3. The complaint stated a cognizable claim for judicial review of the Commissioner's decision under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).
4. The complaint was timely and the court had jurisdiction over the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint must include a statement affirming the court’s jurisdiction, “a short and plain statement of the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief; and a demand for the relief sought, which may include relief in the alternative or different types of relief.”” (at 2)

“a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.”” (at 2)

“Plaintiff’s complaint states a cognizable claim for review of the administrative decision denying Social Security benefits and supplemental income.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Commissioner of Social Security issued an administrative decision denying Plaintiff's claim for disability benefits and supplemental income. The Appeals Council denied Plaintiff's request for review on May 7, 2025. Plaintiff filed this action on July 11, 2025, claimed residence in Kings County, California, and submitted an application and financial affidavit seeking to proceed without prepaying the filing fee.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Appeals Council denied Plaintiff's request for review of the Administrative Law Judge's denial of benefits on May 7, 2025. Plaintiff filed the complaint on July 11, 2025, alleging residence in Kings County, California, and sought review under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). The court granted in forma pauperis status and directed the Clerk to issue a summons, scheduling order, and consent or reassignment documents.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992)
- Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009)
- Ivey v. Board of Regents, 673 F.2 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 556, 570 (2007)
- Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc)

OPINION

(SS) Sales 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 JESUS SALES, Case No. 1:25-cv-00847-CDB (SS) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION TO

PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND

13 v. DIRECTING CLERK OF THE COURT TO

ISSUE SUMMONS, SCHEDULING ORDER,

14 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL AND CONSENT OR REQUEST FOR SECURITY, REASSIGNMENT DOCUMENTS

15 Defendant. (Doc. 2) 16 17 18 Plaintiff Jesus Sales (“Plaintiff”) initiated this action with the filing of a complaint on July 19 11, 2025, seeking review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying 20 disability insurance and benefits. (Doc. 1). Plaintiff did not pay the filing fee and instead filed an 21 application to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (Doc. 2). For the 22 following reasons, the Court finds issuance of the new case documents and Plaintiff’s application 23 to proceed in forma pauperis appropriate. 24 I. Proceeding In Forma Pauperis 25 The Court may authorize the commencement of an action without prepayment of fees “by 26 a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such [person] possesses 27 [and] that the person is unable to pay such fees or give

security therefor.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Here, the Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s application and financial status affidavit (Doc. 2) and finds 1 the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) are satisfied.

2 II. Screening Requirement 3 When a party seeks to proceed in forma pauperis, the Court is required to review the 4 complaint and shall dismiss the complaint, or portion thereof, if it is “frivolous, malicious or fails 5 to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or ... seeks monetary relief from a defendant 6 who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(b) & (e) (2). A plaintiff’s claim is frivolous 7 “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not 8 there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 9 25, 32-33 (1992). 10 III. Pleading Standards 11 A complaint must include a statement affirming the court’s jurisdiction, “a short and plain 12 statement of the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief; and a demand for the relief sought, 13 which may include relief in the alternative or different types of relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The 14 purpose of the complaint is to give the defendant fair notice of the claims, and the grounds upon 15 which the complaint stands. *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002). As set forth 16 by the Supreme Court, Rule 8: 17 ... does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. A pleading that offers 18 labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do. Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertions devoid of 19 further factual enhancement. 20 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). 21 Vague and conclusory allegations do not support a cause of action. *Ivey v. Board of Regents*, 673 22 F.2 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). The *Iqbal* Court clarified further, 23 [A] complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 24 544, 570 (2009). A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is 25 liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.* at 556. The plausibility standard is not akin to a “probability requirement,” but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a 26 defendant has acted unlawfully. *Id.* Where a complaint pleads facts that are “merely consistent with” a defendant’s liability, it “stops short of the line between possibility 27 a nd plausibility of “entitlement to relief.” 1 and determine whether the facts would make the plaintiff entitled to relief; legal conclusions are 2 not entitled to the same assumption of truth. *Id.* The Court may grant leave to amend a complaint 3 to the extent deficiencies of the complaint can be cured by an amendment. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 4 F.3d 1122, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc). 5 IV. Discussion and Analysis 6 Plaintiff seeks review of a decision by the Commissioner of Social Security denying 7 disability benefits. (Doc. 1). The Court may have jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), 8 which provides: 9 Any individual after any final decision of the Commissioner made after a hearing to which he was a party, irrespective of the amount 10 in controversy, may obtain a review of such decision by a civil action commenced within sixty days after the mailing to him of such 11 decision or within such further time as the Commissioner may allow. Such

action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the plaintiff resides or has his principal place of business...The court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript of the record, a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security, with or without remanding the cause for a rehearing. Id. Except as provided by statute, “[n]o findings of fact or decision of the Commissioner shall be reviewed by any person, tribunal, or governmental agency.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(h). On May 7, 2025, the Appeals Council denied Plaintiff’s request for review of the decision of the Administrative Law Judge denying Plaintiff’s claim for benefits and income. (Doc. 1 ¶ 2). On July 11, 2025, Plaintiff filed a complaint in this Court seeking judicial review of the Commissioner’s final decision. See id. Thus, Plaintiff’s complaint is timely. Plaintiff claims residency in Kings County, California. Id. ¶ 4. Therefore, the Court has jurisdiction over this action. V. Conclusion and Order Plaintiff’s complaint states a cognizable claim for review of the administrative decision denying Social Security benefits and supplemental income. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 2) is GRANTED. The Clerk of Court is directed to issue the following: 1) a Summons; 2) the Scheduling Order; 3) the Order re Consent or Request for Reassignment; and 4) a Consent to Assignment or Request for Reassignment form. IT IS SO ORDERED. | Dated: _ July 15, 2025 | hr
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28