

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Goodwin v. Social Security Administration

Goodwin · No. 1:25-cv-00430-SAB · Decided June 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders reassignment of the matter to a district judge and recommends dismissal. The court recommends dismissal without leave to amend for failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with a court order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	June 30, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00430-SAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis failed to file an amended complaint after the magistrate judge screened the complaint, identified deficiencies, and ordered amendment. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal without leave to amend and ordered reassignment of the matter to a district judge because the parties had not all consented to magistrate-judge jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For involuntary dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), the court considers the public interest in expeditious resolution, the court's need to manage its docket, the risk of prejudice to defendants, the public policy favoring disposition on the merits, and the availability of less drastic alternatives. A district court need not make explicit findings on each factor.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Duchun Goodwin v. Social Security Administration, et al.

TOPICS

sanctions

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal courts

in forma pauperis proceedings

pro se litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed for failure to state a claim after Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint correcting deficiencies identified in the screening order.
2. Whether the action should be involuntarily dismissed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and Local Rule 110 for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with a court order.
3. Whether the matter should be reassigned to a district judge because not all parties had consented or declined consent to magistrate-judge jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The action should be dismissed because the complaint failed to state a claim, and Plaintiff failed to cure the deficiencies after being given an opportunity to amend.
2. Dismissal without leave to amend was warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and Local Rule 110 because Plaintiff failed to prosecute the action and failed to comply with the court's order.
3. The Clerk was directed to randomly assign a district judge because not all parties had appeared or filed consent or declination forms for magistrate-judge jurisdiction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Before dismissing an action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41, a court must consider: (1) the public interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage a docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to defendant; (4) public policy favoring disposition on the merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.” (at 2)

“IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court DIRECTED to randomly assign this matter to a District Judge. Furthermore, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this case be dismissed without leave to amend for failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute this action, and/or failure to comply with the Court’s order, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41 and Local Rule 110.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff proceeded pro se and in forma pauperis. After screening the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the court found that it failed to state a claim, explained the deficiencies, and ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint or otherwise respond by the deadline, despite being warned that failure to comply could result in dismissal without leave to amend.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court screened Plaintiff's initial complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and found that it failed to state a claim, directing Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 30 days. Plaintiff failed to comply with the order or file an amended complaint. The magistrate judge therefore issued findings and recommendations recommending dismissal for failure to state a claim, failure to prosecute, and failure to comply with a court order, while directing the Clerk to randomly assign a district judge.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Barren v. Harrington, 152 F.3d 1193 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Applied Underwriters v. Lichtenegger, 913 F.3d 884, 889 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Yourish v. California Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990-91 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 644 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Sibron v. New York, 392 U.S. 40, 57 (1968)
- Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)