1		
2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	WALTHER SHANE LANGSTON,	Case No. 1:16-cv-01445-JLT (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER REVOKING IN FORMA PAUPERIS
13	V.	(Docs. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
14	AVILA,	
15	Defendant.	30 DAY DEADLINE
16		1
17	On November 29, 2016, the Court granted the plaintiff's request to proceed <i>in forma</i>	
18	<i>pauperis</i> . Plaintiff thereafter filed a motion to "supplement" his <i>in forma pauperis</i> status, which	
19	when reviewed in light of the complaint, revealed that Plaintiff was less than truthful as to prior	
20	lawsuits filed while a prisoner and that his <i>in forma pauperis</i> status should be revoked. Thus, on	
21	December 16, 2016, the Court ordered Plaintiff to show cause within 30 days why his <i>in forma</i>	
22	<i>pauperis</i> status should not be revoked. (Doc. 11, OSC.) More than the allowed time has lapsed	
23	and Plaintiff has failed in any way to respond to the OSC.	
24	As stated in the OSC, prisoners may not bring a civil action under 28 U.S.C. §1915(g) if	
25	he or she has, on three or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained, brought an action or appeal that was dismissed as frivelous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which	
26	or appeal that was dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which	
27	relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. Such dismissals are colloquially referred to as "strikes." As also accurately noted in the OSC,	
28		as surves. The use accurately noted in the ODC,
		1

Plaintiff had at least four strikes¹ under section 1915(g) prior to filing this action. Thus, Plaintiff
 may only proceed under section 1915(g) if he meets the imminent danger of serious physical
 injury exception.

The Ninth Circuit has stated that "requiring a prisoner to 'allege [] an ongoing danger'...
is the most sensible way to interpret the immanency requirement." *Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493
F.3d 1047, 1056 (9th Cir.2007), citing *Ashley v. Dilworth*, 147 F.3d 715, 717 (8th Cir.2003). *Andrews* held that the imminent danger faced by the prisoner need not be limited to the time
frame of the filing of the complaint, but may be satisfied by alleging a danger that is ongoing. *See Andrews* at 1053.

10 As found in the OSC, Plaintiff's complaint does not satisfy the imminent danger exception as he does not state any factual allegations, but merely wrote "see attached." (Doc. 1, p. 3.) As 11 Plaintiff well knows due to his experience in filing lawsuits, it is not the Court's job to sift 12 13 through exhibits to ascertain the claims Plaintiff intends to pursue, their factual basis, and the 14 identities of persons whom he intends to pursue as defendants. O'Guinn v. Lovelock Corr. Ctr., 15 502 F.3d 1056, 1060 (9th Cir. 2007) (quoting Bogovich v. Sandoval, 189 F.3d 999, 1001 (9th Cir. 16 1999)) ("[T]he party who brings a suit is master to decide what law he will rely upon.""). 17 Plaintiff does not state allegations upon which to find that he was under imminent danger of serious physical injury at the time the Complaint was filed to satisfy the imminent danger 18 exception to section 1915(g). See Andrews, 493 F.3d at 1055-56. Therefore, Plaintiff must pay 19 20 the \$400.00 filing fee if he wishes to litigate the claims he raises in this action. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS: 21 1. Plaintiff's *in forma pauperis* status is **REVOKED**; 22 /// 23 /// 24

25

26

///

27 ¹ See Case Nos. Langston v. Finn, et al., 2:10-cv-02196-EFB, dismissed on 03/02/2011; Langston v. Enkojii, et al., 2:10-cv-02715-GGH, dismissed on 04/26/2011; Langston v. Finn, et al., 2:08-cv-00275-EFS, dismissed on 05/01/2013; and Langston v. Hartley, et al., 2:10-cv-03191-KJN, dismissed on 05/24/2013.

1	2. <u>Within 30 days</u> from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff SHALL pay the	
2	\$400.00 filing fee for this action in full.	
3	Plaintiff's failure to comply with this order SHALL result in the dismissal of this action.	
4		
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
6	Dated: January 31, 2017 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston	
7	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	3	