

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION****UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

ANWAR SIRAJ GOMEZ-EL, *ex rel.*  
*Carlos O. Larue,*

Plaintiff,

v.

THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-505 (SDW) (LDW)

**WHEREAS OPINION AND ORDER**

May 7, 2024

**WIGENTON**, District Judge.

**THIS MATTER** having come before this Court upon *pro se* Plaintiff Anwar Siraj Gomez-El's ("Plaintiff") filing of an amended complaint (D.E. 4 ("Amended Complaint")) and a short-form application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (D.E. 4-3 ("IFP Application")), and this Court having reviewed Plaintiff's submissions; and

**WHEREAS** this matter was dismissed—and closed—on March 26, 2021, because Plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee or submit an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (D.E. 3.) Three years later, on April 24, 2024, Plaintiff filed the Amended Complaint and the IFP Application. (D.E. 4.) The IFP Application is deficient<sup>1</sup>, and in any event, Plaintiff has presented no justification for reopening this case after such a long delay. Accordingly, this case will remain

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has completed a short-form IFP application, which is not the application accepted in this District. *See, e.g., DiPietro v. New Jersey*, No. 19-17014, 2019 WL 4926865, at \*1 (D.N.J. Oct. 7, 2019) (refusing to accept a short-form IFP application).

closed. Should Plaintiff wish to litigate this case, he must file a new complaint—along with the filing fee or a proper IFP application—under a new docket number<sup>2</sup>; therefore

**IT IS**, on this 7<sup>th</sup> day of May 2024,

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's IFP Application is **DENIED**. This matter will remain closed.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Susan D. Wigenton  
**SUSAN D. WIGENTON, U.S.D.J.**

Orig: Clerk  
cc: Leda Wettre, U.S.M.J.  
Parties

---

<sup>2</sup> It appears that the Amended Complaint principally asks this Court to order Essex County courts and agencies “to nullify, dismiss and/or close [the] (alleged) child support case, cease and desist any further communication and/or correspondence referencing [the] child support enforcement case . . . compelling [Plaintiff] (under threat, duress, and coercion) to make” child support payments. (*Id.* at 3). However, “[c]ourts in this Circuit overwhelmingly abstain[] under the *Younger* doctrine when faced with [such] challenges.” *Frederick of Family Gonora v. Risch*, No. 23-893, 2023 WL 8271932, at \*4 (D.N.J. Nov. 30, 2023) (collecting cases); *see also Gittens v. Kelly*, 790 F. App’x 439, 441 (3d Cir. 2019) (“To the extent that the state court proceeding regarding Gittens’ child support obligations were ongoing, the District Court properly invoked the *Younger* abstention doctrine.”).