

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**

GLORIA ANN CHARLES,

Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

17-cv-955 GSA

**ORDER REQUIRING THE FILING OF AN
AMENDED IN FORMA PAUPERIS
APPLICATION**

On July 17, 2017, Plaintiff Gloria Ann Charles filed a Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (“IFP”). (Doc. 2). A review of the document reveals that it is incomplete. For example, item 6 requires that the applicant, “list persons who are dependent on you for support, the relationship of such person, and how much you contribute to their support.” (Doc. 2, item 2). This item is left blank. It is unclear whether this item was left blank unintentionally, or if Plaintiff has no dependents. This is important because the 2017 United States poverty guidelines for a family of one is \$12,060.00 per year. <https://aspe.hhs.gov/pverty-guidelines>. Plaintiff has indicated that she has a monthly income of \$1,339.00 from Social Security which places her income over the 2017 poverty guidelines. (Doc 2, item 3).

Additionally, the Court has other concerns regarding Plaintiff’s application. Plaintiff also

1 indicates that she owns a 2016 Audi SUV which is a luxury vehicle, and she also owns a single
2 house residence worth \$250,000, for which she owes \$40,000 in payments. She also reports
3 savings of \$3,300. Plaintiff's reported income does not support these assets. As such, Plaintiff
4 shall file an amended application which is complete and includes an explanation of how she is
5 able to have these assets on a limited income, as well as explain why this Court should grant *in*
6 *forma pauperis* to Plaintiff given her financial situation.

7 The Court is unable to process this application until this information is completed.
8 Therefore, Plaintiff shall file an amended application **no later than August 4, 2017**. Plaintiff's
9 counsel is reminded that it is important to review IFP applications for completeness and accuracy
10 prior to filing the document in order to prevent delays and to promote judicial efficiency. The
11 Court notes counsel's lack of attention to this detail is becoming a pattern of practice as reflected
12 in this Court's previous order in *Ruiz v. CSS*, 16-cv-1789 (E.D. Cal., Nov. 23, 2016) (Doc. 3 and
13 6), wherein the Court issued an order requiring that an amended IFP application be filed based on
14 an incomplete application, and the subsequent issuance of Order to Show Cause for counsel's
15 failure to timely respond to the Court's first order. **Counsel is advised that a failure to respond**
16 **to this Court may result in the imposition of sanctions.**

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: July 20, 2017

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE