

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jesus Flores v. Commissioner of Social Security

No. 1:25-cv-01001-SAB (E.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2026) · No. 1:25-cv-01001-SAB · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders Plaintiff Jesus Flores to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to file an opening brief in a Social Security appeal. The Court gives Plaintiff seven days to respond in writing and warns that failure to comply will result in sanctions.

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	January 9, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01001-SAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought an action seeking judicial review of a final decision denying Social Security disability benefits. After the administrative record was lodged, Plaintiff failed to file the required opening brief or request an extension, prompting the court to order Plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Jesus Flores v. Commissioner of Social Security

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure
- administrative law

PRACTICE AREAS

- Social Security
- civil procedure
- sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's failure to file the opening brief or request an extension violated the court's scheduling order.
2. Whether the court should require Plaintiff to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for that failure.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's failure to timely file the opening brief or seek an extension constituted a failure to comply with the court's scheduling order.
2. Plaintiff was required to show cause in writing within seven days why sanctions should not issue for failure to comply with the scheduling order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action.” (at 1)

“Plaintiff is advised that filing an opening brief without showing cause in writing why sanctions should not issue is an insufficient response to this order.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jesus Flores filed an action seeking review of the Commissioner's final decision denying an application for disability benefits under the Social Security Act. The administrative record was lodged on December 9, 2025, and Plaintiff's opening brief was due January 8, 2026 under the scheduling order. Plaintiff filed neither the opening brief nor a request for an extension.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on August 12, 2025. The court issued a scheduling order on August 13, 2025, requiring Plaintiff's opening brief within 30 days after lodging of the administrative record. The record was lodged on December 9, 2025, making the brief due January 8, 2026; no brief or extension request was filed. The court issued this order requiring a written response within seven days explaining why sanctions should not issue.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000)

OPINION

Jesus Flores v. Commissioner of Social Security

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 JESUS FLORES, Case No. 1:25-cv-01001-SAB 11 Plaintiff, ORDER REQUIRING
PLAINTIFF TO

SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS

12 v. SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR

FAILURE TO FILE OPENING BRIEF

13 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

SEVEN-DAY DEADLINE

14 Defendant. 15

16 On August 12, 2025, Plaintiff filed this action seeking judicial review of a final decision 17 of
the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying an application for disability 18
benefits pursuant to the Social Security Act. (ECF No. 1.) On August 13, 2025, the Court issued 19
a scheduling order. (ECF No. 5.) Pursuant to the scheduling order, Plaintiff’s opening brief was 20
due 30 days after the filing of the administrative record. (Id. at 2.) The administrative record 21
was lodged on December 9, 2025 (ECF No. 13), and thus, Plaintiff’s opening brief was due by
22 January 8, 2026. However, neither an opening brief nor request for extension of time has been
23 submitted. 24 Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with
these 25 Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any
and all 26 sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power
to 27 control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where
appropriate, including dismissal of the action. *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841
(9th Cir. 1 | 2000). 2 Plaintiff's failure to timely file the opening brief, or seek an extension to do
so, 3 | constitutes a failure to comply with the Court’s order. Accordingly, Plaintiff will be directed
to 4 | show cause why sanctions should not issue for failure to file the opening brief in compliance
5 | with the Court’s August 13, 2025 scheduling order. 6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY
ORDERED that within seven (7) days of entry 7 | of this order, Plaintiff shall show cause in
writing why sanctions should not issue for the failure 8 | to comply with the Court’s scheduling
order (ECF No. 5). Plaintiff is advised that filing an 9 | opening brief without showing cause in
writing why sanctions should not issue is an insufficient 10 | response _to this order. Failure to
comply with this order will result in the imposition of 11 | sanctions. 12

3 IT IS SO ORDERED. FA. Se

14 | Dated: _ January 9, 2026

STANLEY A. BOONE

15 United States Magistrate Judge 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2026/jesus-flores-v-commissioner-of-social-security-y3aku5q0>