## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 BRANDON ALEXANDER FAVOR, Case No. 1:19-cv-01325-BAM (PC) 12 ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO Plaintiff. RANDOMLY ASSIGN DISTRICT JUDGE TO 13 v. ACTION 14 CORCORAN STATE PRISON, et al., FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION 15 Defendants. FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS BE DENIED 16 (ECF No. 2) 17 **FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE** 18 19 20 Plaintiff Brandon Alexander Favor ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in 21 this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff initiated this action on September 22 23, 2019, together with a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. (ECF Nos. 1, 2.) 23 Plaintiff has not yet submitted a certified copy of his prison trust account statement. 24 Plaintiff is subject to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), which provides that "[i]n no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action . . . under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior 25 26 occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of 27 the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state 28 a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious

physical injury."<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has been informed in prior cases that he is subject to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).<sup>2</sup>

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's complaint and finds that his allegations do not satisfy the imminent danger exception to section 1915(g).<sup>3</sup> Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1053–55 (9th Cir. 2007). Though difficult to read, Plaintiff appears to allege a violation of due process related to a disciplinary proceeding from June 2014, as well as Eighth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment violations regarding confiscation of Plaintiff's property from February 2016. (ECF No. 1.) As such, Plaintiff has not alleged any imminent danger of serious physical injury at the time the complaint was filed and has not satisfied the exception from the three strikes bar under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff must pay the \$400.00 filing fee if he wishes to litigate this action.

Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the Clerk of the Court to randomly assign a District Judge to this action.

## Further, it is HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

- 1. The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, (ECF No. 2), be DENIED, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); and
- 2. Plaintiff be ORDERED to pay the \$400 initial filing fee in full to proceed with this action.

These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within **fourteen (14) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Court takes judicial notice of the following United States District Court cases: (1) <u>Favor-El v. Rome</u>, Case No. 1:15-cv-01865-LJO-EPG (E.D. Cal.) (dismissed on November 22, 2016 for failure to state a claim); (2) <u>Favor v. State of California</u>, Case No. 2:16-cv-02870-JGB-JEM (C.D. Cal.) (dismissed on May 2, 2016 as frivolous, malicious, and for failure to state a claim); and (3) <u>Favor-El v. United States of America</u>, Case No. 2:15-cv-01448-GEB-AC (E.D. Cal.) (dismissed on October 22, 2015 as frivolous).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> <u>See, e.g., Favor v. Monae</u>, Case No. 1:19-cv-00081-LJO-SKO (E.D. Cal.). It is also noteworthy that Plaintiff has been deemed a vexatious litigant, has filed fifty (50) actions in this district alone, and has filed numerous other actions in the other district courts in this state. Plaintiff has also filed actions under the surnames "Favor" and "Favor-El."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Court expresses no opinion on the merits of Plaintiff's claims.

1	file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to
2	Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation." Plaintiff is advised that the failure to file
3	objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of the "right to challenge the
4	magistrate's factual findings" on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir.
5	2014) (citing <u>Baxter v. Sullivan</u> , 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).
6	
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	Dated: September 24, 2019 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	