

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Jose Eduardo M. v. Frank Bisignano

No. 3:25-cv-01039-AHG, United States District Court for the Southern District of California (June 17, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California granted the parties’ joint motion for an extension of time to file the certified administrative record in a Social Security case. The court found good cause and extended the deadline from June 23, 2025, to July 23, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison H. Goddard
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	June 17, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-01039-AHG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought an action seeking review of a Social Security Administration decision. The parties jointly moved to extend the deadline for Defendant to file the certified administrative record.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A request to extend a deadline under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b) requires good cause. The good-cause inquiry focuses primarily on the diligence of the party seeking the extension and the reasons for the requested modification.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- judicial review of agency action

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- administrative law
- Social Security judicial review

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties demonstrated good cause to extend the deadline for Defendant to file the certified administrative record.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties demonstrated good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b), so the court granted their joint motion and extended the deadline for Defendant to serve the certified administrative record by 30 days, to July 23, 2025.

KEY QUOTATIONS

““Good cause” is a non-rigorous standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts.” (1)

“Upon due consideration, the Court finds good cause to GRANT the parties’ joint motion.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Office of Appellate Operations was preparing the certified administrative record, and the preparation process had progressed but was not complete. After the record was prepared, Defendant's counsel needed additional time to review it for accuracy and completeness. The parties therefore jointly requested a 30-day extension of the deadline to file the record.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was filed in the Southern District of California on April 24, 2025. Defendant's certified administrative record was due June 23, 2025, and the parties jointly requested a 30-day extension because the agency was still preparing the record and defense counsel needed additional time to review it. The court granted the motion and continued the deadline to July 23, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc., 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010)
- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 11 12 JOSE EDUARDO M., Case No.: 3:25-cv-01039-AHG 13 Plaintiff, ORDER
GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF 14 v. TIME TO FILE ADMINISTRATIVE
15 FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner of RECORD Social Security,1 16 [ECF No. 6] 17
Defendant. 18 19 Before the Court is the parties’ Joint Motion for Extension of Time to File the 20
Administrative Record (“AR”).

ECF No. 6. 21 Parties seeking to continue a deadline must demonstrate good cause. Chmb.R. at 2 22 (stating that any request for continuance requires “[a] showing of good cause for the 23 request”); see FED. R. CIV. P. 6(b) (“When an act may or must be done within a specified 24 time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time”). “Good cause” is a non-rigorous 25 26 1 Frank Bisignano became the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration on 27 May 7, 2025.

Although Plaintiff originally brought this action against Former Acting Commissioner Lee Dudek, this case may properly proceed against Frank Bisignano 28 1 /standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts. 2 || Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc., 624 F.3d 1253, 1259 (9th Cir. 2010).

The good cause 3 || standard focuses on the diligence of the party seeking to amend the scheduling order and 4 ||the reasons for seeking modification. Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 5 609 (9th Cir. 1992) (“[T]he focus of the inquiry is upon the moving party’s reasons 6 ||for seeking modification.... If that party was not diligent, the inquiry should end.”) 7 || Gnternal citation omitted).

8 Here, the deadline for Defendant to file the AR in this case is June 23, 2025. See 9 ||CivLR 7.1(e)(6)(d) (“The certified administrative record filed by the Social Security 10 || Administration will suffice as the agency’s answer to the complaint, and will be due sixty 11 after transmission of the Notice of Electronic Filing of the complaint”); see also ECF 12 ||No.

2 (the Notice of Electronic Filing, filed on April 24, 2025). Defendant’s counsel 13 represents to the Court that the Office of Appellate Operations “is currently preparing” the 14 || AR and that work on the AR “has progressed.” ECF No. 6-1 at 2.

However, the agency 15 ||needs additional time to prepare the AR and, after it is prepared, counsel then needs to 16 || review it for accuracy and completion. /d. As such, the parties request a 30-day extension. 17 || ECF No. 6 at 2. 18 Upon due consideration, the Court finds good cause to GRANT the parties’ joint 19 ||motion. ECF No. 6.

The deadline for Defendant to serve the Certified Administrative 20 || Record is continued to July 23, 2025. 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 || Dated: June 17, 2025 23 24 _Abiomt. Xl Honorable Allison H. Goddard 25 United States Magistrate Judge 26 27 28