

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEWART MANAGO,

Plaintiff,

VS.

K. HOLLAND, et al.,

## Defendants.

1:13-cv-01523-AWI-GSA-PC

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR  
SPECIAL HEARING, GRANTING  
MOTION TO VACATE ORDER  
COLLECTING PAYMENT OF FILING  
FEE, AND DENYING MOTION FOR  
REFUND OF PARTIAL FILING FEE  
PAID  
(Doc. 17.)

**ORDER VACATING COURT'S  
OCTOBER 8, 2013 ORDER  
DIRECTING CDCR TO SEND  
PAYMENTS FOR THE FILING FEE  
IN THIS CASE  
(Doc. 6.)**

**ORDER FOR CLERK TO SERVE  
COPY OF THIS ORDER ON CDCR  
AND FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT**

## I. BACKGROUND

Stewart Manago (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed the Complaint commencing this action on September 20, 2013. (Doc. 1.) On September 30, 2013, Plaintiff filed motion to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (Doc. 4.) On October 8, 2013, the court issued an order granting Plaintiff leave to proceed in forma pauperis and directing the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to collect monthly payments from Plaintiff’s inmate trust account until the filing fee is paid in full. (Doc. 6.)

On January 14, 2015, the court issued an order revoking Plaintiff's in forma pauperis status pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and dismissing this case, without prejudice to refiling the case with submission of the \$400 filing fee in full. (Doc. 12.)

1           On March 26, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion for a special hearing to stop prison officials  
2 from continuing to collect funds for the filing fee for this case, and for a refund of the partial  
3 filing fee paid to date. (Doc. 17.) Plaintiff's motion is now before the court.

4           **II. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION**

5           Plaintiff argues that he should not be required to pay the filing fee for this case, because  
6 the court revoked his in forma pauperis status and dismissed this case without prejudice to  
7 refiling the case with payment of the filing fee in full. Plaintiff argues that he is entitled to a  
8 refund because the court has not allowed him to litigate this action.

9           **Discussion**

10           Plaintiff was notified in the First Informational Order issued on September 23, 2013 in  
11 this case that “[a]ll pre-trial motions [in this prisoner civil rights case] will be submitted for  
12 decision based solely upon the written papers and *without a hearing*. Local Rule 230(l).” (Doc.  
13 2 at ¶VI.) (emphasis added.) Local Rule 230(l) provides that “[a]ll motions, except motions to  
14 dismiss for lack of prosecution, filed in actions wherein one party is incarcerated and  
15 proceeding in propria persona, shall be submitted upon the record without oral argument unless  
16 otherwise ordered by the Court [and s]uch motions need not be noticed on the motion  
17 calendar.” L.R. 230(l). Therefore, the court shall not schedule a hearing for this motion, and  
18 Plaintiff's request for a special hearing is denied.

19           With respect to the filing fee, Plaintiff is advised that the court continues to collect  
20 monthly payments from a plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis, even after the plaintiff's case  
21 has been dismissed. This is because the filing fee is collected by the court as payment for filing  
22 the case, and subsequent proceedings in a case do not change the fact that the case was filed. A  
23 plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis, without prepayment of the filing fee, is required to make  
24 payments until the filing fee is paid in full. 28 U.S.C. 1915(a)(2).

25           In this case, Plaintiff proceeded in forma pauperis until January 14, 2015, when the  
26 court revoked his in forma pauperis status. (Doc. 12.) To date, the court has received three  
27 payments for the filing fee in this case: \$30.00 on 2/10/14; \$20.00 on 8/25/14; and \$10.00 on  
28 11/17/14. (Court Financial Record.) All of these payments were made before January 14,

1 2015, while Plaintiff was proceeding in forma pauperis and therefore, Plaintiff is not entitled to  
2 a refund of these payments. However, in light of the fact that Plaintiff is not presently  
3 proceeding in forma pauperis and has been granted leave to refile this case with payment of the  
4 filing fee in full, the court shall vacate its payment order directed to the CDCR for this case.

5 **III. CONCLUSION**

6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. Plaintiff's request for a special hearing is DENIED;
- 8 2. Plaintiff's motion for refund of the partial filing fee paid for this action is  
9 DENIED;
- 10 3. Plaintiff's motion for the court to cease further collection of the filing fee for  
11 this action is GRANTED;
- 12 4. **The court's order of October 8, 2013, directing the CDCR to deduct funds  
13 from Plaintiff's prison trust account for payment of the filing fee for this  
14 case is VACATED; and**
- 15 5. The Clerk of Court is directed to serve a copy of this order on:
  - 16 (1) the Director of the CDCR, via CM/ECF; and
  - 17 (2) the Financial Department, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of  
18 California, Fresno Division.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
20

21 Dated: March 31, 2015

22 /s/ Gary S. Austin  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28