

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANETTA SCONIERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA,
et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:11-cv-00113-LJO-SMS
APPEAL NO.

ORDER REFUSING TO CERTIFY
PLAINTIFF’S INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL
AND DENYING PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST TO
FILE APPEAL *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

(Doc. 55)

Plaintiff has requested waiver of the filing fee for a third interlocutory appeal in the above-captioned case. Because the appeal is not taken in good faith, the District Court certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith and orders that Plaintiff’s motion to file an appeal *in forma pauperis* be denied.

I. Procedural History

On January 21, 2011, Plaintiff, by her attorney, Ralston L. Courtney, filed a nearly incomprehensible 569-page complaint against 67 named defendants and 50 “John Doe” defendants alleging numerous causes of action and seeking multiple forms of relief. Plaintiff paid the full filing fee. The District Court has issued three orders to show cause why the

1 complaint should not be dismissed for failure to comply with F.R.Civ.P. 8 and 11. In each
2 instance, Plaintiff has filed an appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Court of
3 Appeals dismissed the first two appeals for lack of jurisdiction.
4

5 **II. Certification and Order Denying Plaintiff's Request to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis***

6 Plaintiff's third appeal clearly having been frivolously taken to delay the order to show
7 cause intended to identify and resolve the Rule 8 and 11 violations in her complaint, this Court

8 **HEREBY CERTIFIES** that Plaintiff's appeal is not taken in good faith. The Court further

9 **ORDERS** that Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* be denied.
10

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 **Dated: October 31, 2011**

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27