1		
1 2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	TONY L. HILL,	Case No. 1:15-cv-00631-JLT (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO
13	V.	DENY PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS
14	CDCR, et al.,	(Doc. 2)
15	Defendants.	30-DAY DEADLINE
16	Plaintiff, Tony L. Hill, is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action	
17	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed the Complaint in this action on April 21. 2015. On	
18	that same date, Plaintiff filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis, which is pending	
19	before the Court.	
20	A. <u>THREE-STRIKES PROVISION OF 28 U.S.C. § 1915</u>	
21	Section 1915 of Title 28 of the United States Code governs proceedings in forma pauperis.	
22	"In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or	
23	more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in	
24	a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or	
25	fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent	
26	danger of serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).	
27	B. <u>DISCUSSION</u>	
28	The Court may take judicial notice of court records. United States v. Howard, 381 F.3d	
	1	

1 873, 876 n.1 (9th Cir. 2004). Here, judicial notice is taken of Hill v. White, et al., Case Number 2 1:13-cv-01275-AWI-DLB (PC). In that action, an order issued denying Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* as Plaintiff had four strikes¹ under section 1915(g) prior to its filing 3 and finding that Plaintiff had not shown that he was in imminent danger of serious physical injury 4 5 at the time he filed suit which precluded him from proceeding *in forma pauperis*. Thus, Plaintiff 6 is subject to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and is precluded from proceeding *in forma pauperis* in this 7 action unless at the time the Complaint was filed, he was under imminent danger of serious 8 physical injury.

9 The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's Complaint and finds that he does not meet the 10 imminent danger exception. See Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1053 (9th Cir. 2007). 11 Plaintiff's Complaint arises from an alleged false rules violation report that was filed against him 12 at Wasco State Prison in April of 2013 which was dismissed. Subsequently, Plaintiff alleges a 13 series of events by the Defendants involved in that false RVR and adverse events that occurred 14 after he was transferred to the Secured Housing Unit at Corcoran State Prison. Plaintiff alleges 15 events that range from tampering of his inmate appeals (Doc. 1, pp. 5-6), to being denied access 16 to the canteen and store (*id.*, at p. 7); being given food trays with flies on them (*id.*); having his 17 cell door repeatedly banged on by a correctional officer (*id.*); having \$40 that his brother sent to 18 him stolen (*id.*, at 7-8); being held at a Level IV prison when he should be at a Level III prison 19 (*id.*, at pp. 7, 9); being denied access to the law library so he couldn't electronically file a 20 complaint (id., at p. 11); notices not being posted as to when the law library would be closed (id., 21 at pp. 12-13); and having his inmate appeals wrongly handled/denied (*id.*, at p. 14). None of 22 these allegations even suggest Plaintiff is at risk of imminent danger at the time he filed the 23 Complaint.

24 25

¹The Court takes judicial notice of the following cases which count as strikes: 1) Hill v. Williams, et al., 2:98-cv-07173-LGB-CT (C.D. Cal.) (dismissed September 15, 1998 for failure to state a claim); 2) Hill v. Wallace, et al.,
27 2:99-cv-06406-ABC-CT (C.D. Cal.) (dismissed July 7, 1999 for failure to state a claim; (3) Hill v. Torrance Police Dept., et al., 2:11-cv-08794-UA-CW (C.D. Cal.) (dismissed July 20, 2012 for failure to state a claim); and (4) Hill v.

Horton, et al., 2:13-cv-00805-UA-CW (C.D. Cal.) (dismissed February 28, 2013 for failure to state a claim).

Plaintiff therefore fails to allege specific facts in the Complaint indicating that he was

1	under imminent danger at the time he filed the Complaint. Based on the foregoing, the Court		
2	finds that Plaintiff fails to allege an imminent danger of serious physical injury necessary to		
3	bypass § 1915(g)'s restriction on filing suit without prepayment of the filing fee.		
4	Accordingly, Plaintiff may not proceed in forma pauperis in this action and must submit		
5	the appropriate filing fee in order to proceed with this action.		
6	C. <u>CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATION</u>		
7	Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff's motion to		
8	proceed in forma pauperis, filed April 21. 2015 (Doc. 2), be denied and that Plaintiff be ordered		
9	to pay the filing fee in full.		
10	These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District		
11	Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within 30		
12	days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may file written		
13	objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's		
14	Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the		
15	specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834,		
16	839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).		
17	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
18			
19	Dated: April 29, 2015 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25 25			
26			
27			
28			
	3		