

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.  
CORCORAN STATE PRISON, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:19-cv-01325-LJO-BAM (PC)  
**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING  
DENIAL OF PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO  
PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS***  
(ECF Nos. 2, 7)  
**TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE**

Plaintiff Brandon Alexander Favor (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff initiated this action on September 23, 2019.

On September 25, 2019, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations that Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* be denied pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and that Plaintiff be required to pay the \$400.00 filing fee in full to proceed with this action. (ECF No. 7.) Those findings and recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (Id. at 2–3.) On October 7, 2019, Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations, together with a renewed motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF Nos. 8, 9.)

///

1 In his objections, which are rambling and difficult to understand, Plaintiff presents no  
2 grounds that warrant overturning the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations. Plaintiff  
3 presents arguments apparently relating to the merits of this action, and then sets forth his  
4 requested relief. Plaintiff has also attached more than 100 pages of unreferenced and  
5 unincorporated exhibits. (ECF No. 8.) None of the provided arguments or exhibits address the  
6 Magistrate Judge’s findings that Plaintiff is subject to the “three strikes” bar under 28 U.S.C.  
7 § 1915(g), or that Plaintiff’s allegations fail to satisfy the imminent danger exception to section  
8 1915(g).

9 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a  
10 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff’s  
11 objections, the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations are  
12 supported by the record and proper analysis.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 14 1. The findings and recommendations, (ECF No. 7), issued on September 25, 2019,  
15 are adopted in full;
- 16 2. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma*  
17 *pauperis* (ECF No. 2) is denied; and
- 18 3. Within **twenty-one (21) days** following the date of service of this order, Plaintiff  
19 shall pay the \$400.00 filing fee in full to proceed with this action. If Plaintiff fails  
20 to pay the filing fee within the specified time, this action will be dismissed without  
21 further notice.

22  
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: October 9, 2019

/s/ Lawrence J. O’Neill  
25 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE