(PC) Larson v. Doe, et al.		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9	HARVEY EUGENE LARSON,	CASE NO. 1:08-cv-00998-AWI-DLB PC
10		ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
11	Plaintiff,	RECOMMENDATIONS, AND DENYING
12	V.	PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS
13	JOHN DOE, et al.,	(Doc. 17).
14	Defendants.	
15	/	
16	Plaintiff Harvey Eugene Larson ("plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil	
17	rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate	
18	Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72-302.	
19	On February 18, 2009, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations herein	
20	which was served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objection to the	
21	Findings and Recommendations was to be filed within fifteen days. Plaintiff filed an Objection to	
22	the Findings and Recommendations on March 6, 2009. <sup>1</sup>	
23	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a	
24	<u>de novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the Findings	
25		
26	<sup>1</sup> On March 19, 2009, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal of this court's order vacating an order granting Plaintiff leave to proceed in forma pauperis. (Docs. 18, 20). "When a Notice of Appeal is defective in that it refers to a non-appealable interlocutory order, it does not transfer jurisdiction to the appellate court, and so the ordinary rule that the district court cannot act until the mandate has issued on the appeal does not apply." Nascimento v. Dummer, 508 F.3d 905, 908 (9th Cir. 2007). Because no appeal lies from an order vacating a previous order, this action shall proceed despite the filing of the March 19, 2009 Notice of Appeal.	
27		
28		

Doc. 25

and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: The Findings and Recommendations, filed February 18, 2009 is adopted in full; 1. 2. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), Plaintiff is denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis; 3. Plaintiff is ordered to submit the \$350.00 filing fee in full within fifteen (15) days; and If Plaintiff fails to pay the \$350.00 filing fee in full within fifteen (15) days, this 4. action shall be dismissed, without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>April 17, 2009</u> /s/ Anthony W. Ishii CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE