#### Miller v. Midtown Park Apartments

#### Doc. 3

## THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS CENTRAL DIVISION

## TAMECKA MILLER

#### Case No. 4:21-cv-00597-KGB

#### **MIDTOWN PARK APARTMENTS**

## <u>ORDER</u>

Before the Court is *pro se* plaintiff Tamecka Miller's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") (Dkt. No. 1). To rule on such a motion, generally, the Court would examine Ms. Miller's IFP application to ascertain whether she has sufficient funds to pay the \$402.00 civil filing fee. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) *et seq*. However, the Court lacks the requisite information to make that determination because of Ms. Miller's incomplete IFP application (*Id.*).

On the first page of her IFP application, Ms. Miller indicates that she makes "\$1,733" (*Id.*). However, she provides no indication of her pay period (*Id.*). Ms. Miller leaves the Court to guess whether she makes \$1,733.00 every two weeks, every month, or is paid on some other undefined schedule (*Id.*). The Court will not assume the duration of Ms. Miller's pay period (*Id.*). *See generally Madden v. Arkansas*, No. 5:09CV00010JLH/BD, 2009 WL 856986, at \*1 (E.D. Ark. Mar. 30, 2009).

# PLAINTIFF

DEFENDANT

v.

For the reasons set out above, the Court denies without prejudice Ms. Miller's IFP application and directs her to file a new and complete IFP application or pay the \$402.00 filing fee within 30 days of this Order (Dkt. No. 1). Under Local Rule 5.5(c)(2), failure to comply timely with this Order may result in the Court dismissing without prejudice Ms. Miller's complaint.

It is so ordered this 17th day of January, 2023.

Knistin &. Pontur

Kristine G. Baker United States District Judge