1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 No. 1:18-cv-00767-NONE-HBK (PC) 11 CHRISTOPHER LIPSEY, JR., ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND 12 Plaintiff. RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO 13 v. REVOKE PLAINTIFF'S IN FORMA *PAUPERIS* PRIVILEGE 14 DR. DEPOVIC, et al., (Doc. Nos. 31, 40) 15 Defendants. 16 17 On June 28, 2018, the then-assigned magistrate judge granted plaintiff's application to 18 proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") in this action. (Doc. No. 9.) Defendants then moved on April 19 13, 2020 to revoke plaintiff's IFP status, arguing plaintiff is a three-strikes litigant barred from 20 proceeding in forma pauperis in this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). (Doc. No. 31.) Plaintiff 21 filed an opposition to that motion, to which defendants filed a reply, followed by plaintiff's sur-22 reply. (Doc. Nos. 33, 34, 35.) On May 27, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge recommended 23 that the court deny defendants' motion because defendants failed to identify three dismissal order 24 qualifying under the statute as strikes that plaintiff had accrued prior to filing the instant action.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings

(Doc. No. 40.) Defendants did not object to findings and recommendations, and the period to do

25

26

27

28

so has now passed. (See docket.)

and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations entered on May 27, 2021, (Doc. No. 40), are adopted; 2. Defendants' motion to revoke plaintiff's in forma pauperis status (Doc. No. 31), is denied; 3. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings consistent with this order. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **July 14, 2021**