

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

DONALD CHARLES BLAIR, et al.,)	Case No.: 1:15-cv-01451 - LJO - JLT
)	
Plaintiffs,)	ORDER ADOPTING IN FULL THE FINDINGS
)	AND RECOMMENDATIONS DENYING
v.)	PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO PROCEED IN
)	FORMA PAUPERIS
OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiffs initiated this action by filing a complaint and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on September 24, 2015. (Docs. 1-2) The Magistrate Judge reviewed Plaintiffs’ application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and noted Plaintiffs reported a joint income of \$16,500.00. (Doc. 3 at 3, citing Doc. 3 at 2) Based upon the income and monthly expenses reported, the Magistrate Judge found Plaintiffs failed to satisfy the requirements of 28 U.S.C. §1915, which requires applicants to demonstrate they cannot meet court costs and still provide themselves with the necessities of life. (Id.; see also Martinez v. Kristi Kleaners, Inc., 364 F.3d 1305, 1307 (11th Cir. 2004)). Therefore, the Magistrate Judge recommended their request be denied.

Plaintiffs were given fourteen days to file any objections to the recommendation that their request to proceed *in forma pauperis* be denied. (Doc. 3 at 2) In addition, Plaintiffs were “advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order.” (Id., citing Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991); Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d

1 834, 834 (9th Cir. 2014)). To date, no objections have been filed, and Plaintiffs paid the filing fee on
2 November 17, 2015.

3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C) and Britt v. Simi Valley United
4 School Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), this Court conducted a de novo review of the case.
5 Having carefully reviewed the file, the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations are supported
6 by the record and proper analysis.

7 Based upon the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- 8 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated November 2, 2015 (Doc. 3) are **ADOPTED**
9 **IN FULL**; and
- 10 2. Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 2) is **DENIED**.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: November 23, 2015

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE