1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	RICHARD JOSE DUPREE, JR.,	Case No. 1:15-cv-01587-SKO (PC)
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER (1) REVOKING IN FORMA PAUPERIS STATUS, (2) VACATING ORDER DIRECTING CDCR TO COLLECT FILING FEE, (3) DIRECTING CLERK'S OFFICE TO SERVE ORDER ON CDCR AND FINANCIAL DEPT., AND (4)
12	v.	
13	CDCR, et al.,	
14	Defendants.	DISMISSING ACTION
15		(Doc. 6)
16		
17	Plaintiff Richard Jose Dupree, Jr. ("Plaintiff"), a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this	
18	civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on October 8, 2015. Plaintiff was granted leave to	
19	proceed in forma pauperis on October 20, 2015. However, the Court has since determined that	
20	Plaintiff is subject to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), which provides that "[i]n no event shall a prisoner bring	
21	a civil action under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while	
22		
23		
24	which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physica	
25	injury." The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's complaint and finds that his allegations do not satisfy	
26	<del>.</del>	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Prior to the date he filed this action, Plaintiff had more than three case dismissals that qualify as strikes under section 1915(g). *Coleman v. Tollefson*, \_\_ U.S. \_\_, \_\_, 135 S.Ct. 1759, 1765 (2015). The Court takes judicial notice of the following three Eastern District of California cases that count as strikes: *Dupree v. Santiago, et al.*, 2:11-cv-00309-EFB (E.D.Cal.) (dismissed for failure to state a claim on Feb. 22, 2011); *Dupree v. Scott*, 1:11-cv-00565-OWW-DLB

the imminent danger exception to section 1915(g). Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1055-1 2 56 (9th Cir. 2007). Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS as follows: 3 1. Plaintiff's in forma pauperis status is REVOKED; 2. The order directing the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation 4 5 ("CDCR") to collect the filing fee is VACATED;<sup>3</sup> The Clerk's Office shall serve a copy of this order on (1) the Director of CDCR via 6 3. 7 CM/ECF and (2) the Financial Department, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of 8 California, Fresno Division; and 9 4. This action is dismissed, without prejudice to refiling accompanied by the \$400.00 10 filing fee. 11 IT IS SO ORDERED. 12 Dated: **December 7, 2015** /s/ Sheila K. Oberto 13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 (E.D.Cal.) (dismissed for failure to state a claim on Jul. 12, 2011); and Dupree v. Stephens, et al., 1:11-cv-01193-GSA 23 (E.D.Cal.) (dismissed for failure to state a claim on Jul. 22, 2011). 24 <sup>2</sup> Plaintiff is presently incarcerated at California State Prison-Sacramento. His claims in this action arise from a California State Prison-Corcoran classification committee decision to classify him as an "R" suffix inmate. Plaintiff 25 was written up twenty-one times for indecent exposure in prison but he was never criminally charged for the offenses, other than one misdemeanor conviction. Plaintiff challenges the "R" suffix classification, and he alleges that he has been subjected to verbal abuse by guards in front of other prisoners, which in turn subjects him to "imminent danger" 26 within the prison population. (Doc. 1, Comp., 6:20-21.) These allegations do not satisfy the imminent danger exception, which requires plausible allegations of imminent danger of serious physical injury at the time of filing. 27 Andrews, 493 F.3d at 1055-56. 28

<sup>3</sup> Court records reflect that none of the filing has been collected.