1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	SEAVON PIERCE,	No. 1:16-cv-01083 LJO DLB PC	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DISMISSING ACTION, WITHOUT PREJUDICE, PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1915(G)	
13	v.		
14	BARACK OBAMA, et al.,		
15	Defendants.		
16			
17	Plaintiff Seavon Pierce ("Plaintiff"), a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil		
18	rights action on February 24, 2016. The action was transferred to this Court on July 27, 2016.		
19	Plaintiff also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis.		
20	Plaintiff is subject to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), which provides that "[i]n no event shall a		
21	prisoner bring a civil action under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior		
22	occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of		
23	the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state		
24	a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious		
25	physical injury." ¹		
26	¹ The Court takes judicial notice of the following cases: <i>Pierce v. Gonzales, et al.</i> , 1:10-cv-00285-JLT (dismissed		
77	The Court takes judicial notice of the following case	es: <i>Pierce v. Gonzales, et al.</i> , 1:10-cv-00285-JLT (dismissed	

^{on December 3, 2012, for failure to state a claim);} *Pierce v. Lancaster State Prison*, 2:13-cv-08126 (dismissed on December 3, 2013, as frivolous, malicious, and for failure to state a claim); and *Pierce v. Warden of Lancaster*, 2:13-cv-01939-UA-CW (dismissed on March 28, 2013, as frivolous, malicious, and for failure to state a claim).

1	The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's complaint and finds that he does not meet the imminent		
2	danger exception. See Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1053 (9th Cir. 2007). Plaintiff names		
3	President Barack Obama as the Defendant in the caption, and he references an action for the denial of		
4	medical treatment. While Plaintiff states that he has injuries that present an imminent danger to his		
5	health, it appears that those injuries arise from another action in this court, which was dismissed for		
6	failure to state a claim in December 2012. Although it is not entirely clear, the current action alleges		
7	interference with court communications and a related attempt to conceal the tampering. Therefore,		
8	any allegations of imminent danger have nothing to the subject matter of the underlying action. ²		
9	Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that Plaintiff fails to allege an imminent danger of		
10	serious physical injury necessary to bypass § 1915(g)'s restriction on filing suit without		
11	prepayment of the filing fee since he has accumulated three strikes. If Plaintiff wishes to pursue		
12	this action, he must first pay the \$400.00 filing fee.		
13	Accordingly, this action is HEREBY ORDERED DISMISSED, without prejudice to re-		
14	filing accompanied by the \$400.00 filing fee.		
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
16	Dated: August 11, 2016 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill		
17	UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	² Plaintiff also attaches exhibits that appear to be related to other actions in which he lists himself as one of many petitioners. Most, if not all, of his exhibits are related to his interference claim.		
	2		