Holt-Fletes	٧.	Commissioner of Social Security
		-

1					
2					
3					
4					
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON				
7	LAURA K. HOLT-FLETES,	No. 2:17-cv-00295-MKD			
8	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING			
9	vs.	DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS			
10	COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	ECF NO. 10			
11	SECURITY,				
12	Defendant. BEFORE THE COURT is Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 10)				
13	filed October 27, 2017 asking the Court to dismiss the Complaint for lack of				
14	jurisdiction. Plaintiff subsequently filed the Amended Civil Complaint. ECF No.				
15	11. After review of the Motion, the court expedites the hearing without further				
16	response. Local Rule 7.1(h). Attorney Cathy Helman represents Plaintiff; Special				
17	United States Assistant Attorney Joseph Langkamer represents Defendant. The				
18	parties have consented to proceed before a magistrate judge. ECF No. 8. The				
19	Court has reviewed the record herein and is fully informed.				
20	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 req	uires that complaints consist of "(1) a			

short and plain statement of the ground for the court's jurisdiction...(2) a short and
plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and (3) a
demand for the relief sought..." Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a). In this case, this Court only
has jurisdiction to review the Commissioner's "final decision." 42 U.S.C. §
405(g). The administrative law judge's decision becomes the final decision of the
Commissioner when the Appeals Council denies review. *See Sam v. Astrue*, 550
F.3d 808, 810 (9th Cir. 2008).

8 Defendant's Motion contends the allegations in Plaintiff's original Complaint, ECF No. 4, are insufficient to confer subject matter jurisdiction 9 10 because it seeks review of the Appeals Council's decision denying Plaintiff's 11 request for review. ECF No. 10. The Complaint did not specifically describe the action taken by the Appeals Council, however, to the extent it was a denial of 12 13 review, this type of action is not a "final decision" and therefore not subject to judicial review. See Brewes v. Comm'r of Soc. Sec. Admin., 682 F.3d 1157 (9th 14 Cir. 2012) ("[W]e do not have jurisdiction to review a decision of the Appeals 15 Council denying a request for review of an ALJ's decision, because the Appeal 16 Council decision is a non-final agency action."). 17

Plaintiff's Amended Complaint corrects the deficiency by amending the
pleading to ask the court to "review the final decision of the Commissioner" and
set aside "the decision of the Commissioner..." ECF No. 11 at 2. However,

ORDER - 2

Plaintiff persists in characterizing the Appeals Council's order as "the Final Order" which in this court's experience reviewing social security records, has no legal or 2 3 factual basis. See Moore v. Astrue, EDWA Cause No. 2:11-cv-00268-CI, 2013 WL 53721, at *3 (E.D.Wash. Jan. 3, 2013) (unpublished) (concluding "Plaintiff's 4 characterization of the Appeals council's action...as a 'Final Order' is without 5 factual or legal basis."). The next sentence of the Amended Complaint vaguely 6 7 refers to "[s]aid final decision" without identifying it. ECF No. 11 at 1.

8 Plaintiff's counsel has filed a number of cases in this District utilizing a 9 pleading similar to the original Complaint, which Defendant has answered without 10 contesting jurisdiction. It is reasonable to infer that Plaintiff is seeking judicial 11 review of the denial of an application for Social Security benefits. Nonetheless, social security appellants are not exempt from the rules of civil pleading in federal 12 13 court, which are not onerous. Plaintiff could further improve the pleading to 14 ensure it contains both a short and *plain* statement meeting the requirements of Rule 8. The Court, however, concludes the Plaintiff's allegations in the Amended 15 Complaint, are an adequate statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction 16 and will not require further amendment at this time. 17

18

19

20

1

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 10) is DENIED.

2. Defendant shall file its response to the Amended Complaint and the

ORDER - 3

1	administrative transcript by not later than November 6, 2017 .
2	The District Court Executive is directed to enter this Order and forward
3	copies to counsel.
4	DATED October 27, 2017.
5	<u>s/Mary K. Dimke</u> MARY K. DIMKE
6	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
	ORDER - 4