

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR,
Plaintiff,
v.
MONAE, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-00756-LJO-SKO (PC)
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS; DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*; AND ORDERING PLAINTIFF TO PAY THE FILING FEE
(Docs. 2, 7)
21-DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* along with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On June 12, 2017, the Magistrate Judge issued Findings and Recommendations to deny Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* based on his untrue poverty allegation. (Doc. 9.) The Findings and Recommendations were served on Plaintiff on that same date and allowed for objections to be filed within twenty-one days. (*Id.*) Plaintiff filed objections which are largely nonsensical. (Doc. 9.)

In his objections, Plaintiff states that, although he is in state custody, he does not consider himself a state prisoner. (Doc. 9, p. 1.) Plaintiff states that he "seeks payment availability under company entity Brandon Favor, LLP, however under relief identity, plaintiff must not distraught filing order without clarity declared under the penalty of perjury or without complete filing order declared, sound and acceptable. Plaintiff seeks not to address three strikes under § 1915 which

1 under appeal and demonstrates Central District Clerk filing, retains all and any original medical
2 supplications documents” The Court is unable to find anything in Plaintiff’s objections that
3 contradict the magistrate judge’s findings that Plaintiff had three strikes under § 1915 prior to
4 filing this action and that Plaintiff was not under imminent danger at the time he filed this
5 complaint to meet the exception under § 1915(g).

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a
7 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the
8 Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

9 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- 10 1. the Findings and Recommendations, issued on June 12, 2017 (Doc. 7), are adopted
11 in full;
- 12 2. Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, filed on June 2, 2017 (Doc. 2),
13 is **DENIED**;
- 14 3. **within 21 days** of the date of service of this order, Plaintiff is required to pay in
15 full the \$400.00 filing fee for this action; and
- 16 4. **Plaintiff’s failure to comply with this order shall result in the dismissal of this**
17 **action without prejudice.**

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: **July 12, 2017**

20 **/s/ Lawrence J. O’Neill**
21 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE