

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RAYMOND GEORGE GLASS,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. TERCERO,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:14-cv-02065-AWI- DLB PC

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA
PAUPERIS ON APPEAL**

| (Document 13)

Plaintiff Ronald George Glass (“Plaintiff”) is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this action on December 24, 2014.

On January 12, 2015, the Court dismissed the action because Plaintiff's removal was improper, and because Plaintiff has accrued three strikes under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and did not meet the imminent danger requirement. The Court also denied Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis as moot.

Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal on February 2, 2015.

Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(1) provides that a party wishing to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal must file a motion in the district court. The party must attach an affidavit that:

(A) shows in the detail prescribed by Form 4 of the Appendix of Forms the party's inability to pay or to give security for fees and costs;

1 (B) claims an entitlement to redress; and

2 (C) states the issues that the party intends to present on appeal.

3 On February 23, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

4 An appeal is taken in good faith if the appellant seeks review of any issue that is not
5 frivolous. Gardner v. Pogue, 558 F.2d 548, 550-51 (9th Cir. 1977); see also Hooker v. American
6 Airlines, 302 F.3d 1091, 1092 (9th Cir. 2002) (if at least one issue or claim is non-frivolous, the
7 appeal must proceed in forma pauperis as a whole).

8 Here, Plaintiff fails to state any issues that he intends to present on appeal, and the Court can
9 discern no basis for Plaintiff's appeal, other than a mere disagreement with the Court's order.

10 Moreover, the Court finds that any grounds for appeal would be frivolous. Plaintiff's action was
11 dismissed because he was improperly attempting to "remove" his closed action from state court.
12 Plaintiff was also deemed to have three strikes" under 28 U.S.C. 1915(g), and he did not meet the
13 imminent danger exception.

14 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS as follows:

15 1. Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3)(A), the Court finds that the appeal was not taken
16 in good faith; and

17 2. Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(4)(B), the Clerk of the Court shall serve this order
18 on Plaintiff and the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20
21 Dated: February 26, 2015


22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE