

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 DANA GRAY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 ROMERO, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16
17

1:13-cv-01473-DAD-GSA-PC
Appeal #17-17017

**ORDER THAT PLAINTIFF IS
AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED IN FORMA
PAUPERIS ON APPEAL**

(ECF No. 277.)

18 Dana Gray (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with
19 this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case was filed on September 12,
20 2013. (ECF No. 1.)

21 On October 6, 2017, Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of
22 Appeals, appealing the districts court’s orders as follows:

- 23 (1) Order denying Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel (ECF No. 267),
24 issued on September 7, 2017;
25 (2) Order denying Plaintiff’s motions as moot (ECF No. 269), issued on September
26 11, 2017;
27 (3) Order denying Plaintiff’s motions for reconsideration (ECF No. 270), issued on
28 September 11, 2017;

1 (4) Order denying Plaintiff's motion to designate expert witness (ECF No. 271),
2 issued on September 11, 2017; and

3 (5) Order denying requests for judicial notice (ECF No. 272), issued on September
4 11, 2017.

5 (ECF No. 276.) Plaintiff also filed a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal.
6 (ECF No. 277.)

7 Pursuant to Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, a party who was
8 permitted to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the district-court action may proceed *in forma*
9 *pauperis* on appeal without prior authorization. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). In this case,
10 Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the district-court action was granted on
11 September 18, 2013. (ECF No. 4.)

12 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff is authorized to proceed *in*
13 *forma pauperis* on appeal.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: October 12, 2017

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE