1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	CHARLA JUNE HOOPER,) Case No.: 1:15-cv-0348- JLT	
12	Plaintiff,	 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO PROCEED INFORMA PAUPERIS 	
13	V.)) (Doc. 2)	
14	CAROLYN W. COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,)	
15		 ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO ISSUE SUMMONS AND SOCIAL SECURITY CASE 	
16	Defendant.) DOCUMENTS)	
17 18		 ORDER DIRECTING UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR SERVICE OF COMPLAINT 	
19	Plaintiff Charla June Hooper seeks to proceed in forma pauperis with an action for judicial		
20	review of the administrative decision denying her application for Social Security benefits. Pending		
21	before the Court are the complaint (Doc. 1) and motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 2), filed by		
22	Plaintiff on March 4, 2015.		
23	I. MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORM	A PAUPERIS	
24	The Court may authorize the commence	ement of an action without prepayment of fees "but a	
25	person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such person possesses [and]		
26	that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). The Court		
27	has reviewed the application and finds Plaintiff satisfies the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).		
28	Therefore, Plaintiff's request to proceed in form	na pauperis is GRANTED .	

1

II.

SCREENING REQUIREMENT

When an individual seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court is required to review the
complaint and shall dismiss a complaint, or portion of the complaint, if it is "frivolous, malicious or
fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or . . . seeks monetary relief from a defendant
who is immune from such relief." 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). A plaintiff's claim
is frivolous "when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or
not there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S.
25, 32-33 (1992).

9

14

III. PLEADING STANDARDS

General rules for pleading complaints are governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. A pleading 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." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a).

A complaint must state the elements of the plaintiff's claim in a plain and succinct manner.

15 Jones v. Cmty Redevelopment Agency, 733 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 1984). The purpose of the

16 complaint is to give the defendant fair notice of the claims against him, and the grounds upon which

17 || the complaint stands. *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002). The Supreme Court

18 explained,

- Rule 8 does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. A pleading that offers labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do. Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertions devoid of further factual enhancement.
- 22 Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

23 Conclusory and vague allegations do not support a cause of action. *Ivey v. Board of Regents*, 673 F.2d

24 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). The Court clarified further,

[A] complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to "state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." [Citation]. A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. [Citation]. The plausibility standard is not akin to a "probability requirement," but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully. [Citation]. Where a complaint pleads facts that are "merely consistent with" a defendant's liability, it "stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of 'entitlement to relief."

Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 679 (citations omitted). When factual allegations are well-pled, a court should
 assume the truth and determine whether the facts would make the plaintiff entitled to relief; conclusions
 in the pleading are not entitled to the same assumption of truth. *Id*. The Court may grant leave to
 amend a complaint to the extent deficiencies of the complaint can be cured by amendment. *Lopez v*.
 Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc).

6

12

13

14

15

20

IV. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Here, Plaintiff's complaint indicates her application and appeal for Social Security benefits have
been denied, and she seeks review of the decision by the Commissioner of Social Security to deny
benefits. (Doc. 1 at 1-2.) The Court has jurisdiction over such claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g),
which provides in relevant part:
Any individual, after any final decision of the Commissioner made after a hearing to

- Any individual, after any final decision of the Commissioner made after a hearing to which he was a party, irrespective of the amount in controversy, may obtain a review of such decision by a civil action commenced within sixty days after the mailing to him of such decision or within such further time as the Commissioner may allow. Such action shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the plaintiff resides, or has his principal place of business . . . The court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript of the record, a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security, with or without remanding the cause for a rehearing.
- 16 *Id.* Except as provided by statute, "[n]o findings of fact or decision of the Commissioner shall be
- 17 || reviewed by any person, tribunal, or governmental agency." 42 U.S.C. § 405(h). The Supreme Court
- 18 noted the purpose of the legislation was "to forestall repetitive or belated litigation of stale eligibility
- 19 claims." Califano v. Sanders, 430 U.S. 99, 108 (1977).

Plaintiff asserts the Appeals Council denied her request for review on Janaury 6, 2015, at

21 which time the decision of the administrative law judge became the decision of the Commissioner.

22 (Doc. 1 at 2.) Therefore, Plaintiff seeks timely judicial review, and the Court has jurisdiction over the

23 matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

24 **V.** CONCLUSION AND ORDER

25 Plaintiff's complaint states a cognizable claim for review of the administrative decision denying

26 Social Security benefits. Based upon the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**:

- 27
- 1. Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 2) is **GRANTED**;
- 28

1		Colvin, Acting Commissioner of Social Security;	
2	3.	The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to issue and serve Plaintiff with Social Security Case	
3		Documents, including the Scheduling Order, Order regarding Consent, the Consent	
4		Form, and USM-285 Forms; and	
5	4.	The U.S. Marshal is DIRECTED to serve a copy of the complaint, summons, and this	
6		order upon the defendant as directed by Plaintiff in the USM Forms.	
7			
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
9	Dated:	March 9, 2015 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston	
10		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		4	