

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 DIERDRA LONDONO,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
15 SECURITY.,

16 Defendant.

1:16-cv-01897-EPG

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO PROCEED
IN FORMA PAUPERIS WITHOUT
PREJUDICE

(ECF No. 3)

17
18 On December 19, 2016, Plaintiff Dierdra Londono filed a complaint seeking judicial
19 review of a final decision by the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying
20 her application for disability benefits. Additionally, Plaintiff simultaneously filed a motion to
21 proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP application”). (ECF No. 3.)

22 As an initial matter, the IFP application is made by “Dierdra L. Burston.” However, the
23 docket indicates that the complaint was filed Plaintiff Dierdra Londono. The complaint states
24 that this case was initiated by “Dierdra Burston Londono.” (ECF No. 1.) While the Court can
25 surmise that the IFP applicant is likely the same person as the person initiating this case, the
26 IFP application should accurately reflect the name of Plaintiff. This inconsistency can be fixed
27 upon re-filing the IFP application.
28

1 Second, question 3 of the IFP asks whether Plaintiff has received any money from other
2 sources, to which Plaintiff responded in the affirmative. The second part of the question asks
3 the applicant to provide details concerning the source of money, the amount received and what
4 you expect you will continue to receive. Plaintiff answered only that “[m]y husband supports
5 me.” The Court requires additional information in connection with this question, regarding the
6 amount of support and resources available to the husband.

7 The Court will deny the IFP application. (ECF No. 3.) However, Plaintiff may refile an
8 IFP application correcting the issues identified in this order.

9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: December 21, 2016

12 /s/ Eric P. Groj
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28