UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL MANJEET SINGH,

1:22-cv-01446-GSA-PC

12 ||

Plaintiff,

VS.

.

PHEIFFER, ET AL.,

Defendants.

ORDER FOR CLERK TO RANDOMLY ASSIGN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE TO THIS CASE

AND

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, RECOMMENDING THAT PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS BE DENIED (ECF No. 4.)

OBJECTIONS, IF ANY, DUE IN 14 DAYS

I. FINDINGS

Michael Manjeet Singh ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 9, 2022, Plaintiff filed the Complaint commencing this action. (ECF No. 1.) On November 14, 2022, Plaintiff filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* along with a certified copy of his prison trust account, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (ECF No. 4.)

Plaintiff's trust account statement shows that on November 4, 2022, he had a balance of \$15,947.50. (Id.) Under these facts the court finds that Plaintiff can afford the \$402.00 filing

fee for this action. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* should be denied, and Plaintiff should be required to pay the statutory filing fee of \$400.00 for this action in full.

II. ORDER, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

A. Order

The Clerk is hereby directed to randomly assign a United States District Judge to this action; and

B. Recommendations and Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, filed on November 14, 2022, be DENIED; and
- 2. Plaintiff be required to pay the \$402.00 filing fee for this action in full.

These findings and recommendations are 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 the date of service of these findings and recommendations, Plaintiff may file written objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 17, 2022 /s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE