

**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

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