

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM HUBERT LLOYD
BRANDSTATT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DR. ANTHONY ENENMOH, C.M.O,
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-00434-RRB

**ORDER RE MOTION
AT DOCKET NO. 6**

At Docket No. 6 Plaintiff William Hubert Lloyd Brandstatt a state prisoner appearing *pro se*, filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. On April 2, 2013 this Court served on Brandstatt an Order to Submit Application to Proceed in Forma Pauperis or pay the filing fee within 45 days.¹ Attached to that Order was an IFP Application form. Brandstatt's motion does not comply with that Order. Accordingly,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* at Docket No. 6 is **STRICKEN**.

¹ Dkt. No. 3.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that on or before **July 19, 2013**, Plaintiff must comply with the Order dated April 1, 2013, or this matter will be dismissed, without prejudice and without further notice to Plaintiff.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to re-serve the Order entered at Docket No. 3 on Plaintiff together with this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 13th day of June, 2013.

S/RALPH R. BEISTLINE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE