

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; limited persuasive value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)