

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

HENRY MEADOWS,)	2:07-cv-00475-HDM-RAM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER
vs.)	
)	
PORTER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

On May 26, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion seeking production of trial transcripts in connection with his appeal of the judgment in this action (#143). On June 16, 2010, the court ordered plaintiff to supplement his motion to set forth the basis for his appeal and the reasons he needs trial transcripts in connection with the appeal. Plaintiff was ordered to file his supplement on or before July 1, 2010. As of this date, plaintiff has not filed any supplement.

There is no indication on the record that any transcripts have

1 been made in this action. Thus, there is nothing the court can
2 order be produced to the plaintiff. The court therefore construes
3 plaintiff's motion as one for production of a transcript at
4 government expense. See 28 U.S.C. § 753(f).

5 Under 28 U.S.C. § 753(f), "[f]ees for transcripts furnished in
6 . . . proceedings to persons permitted to appeal in forma pauperis
7 shall . . . be paid by the United States if the trial judge or a
8 circuit judge certifies that the appeal is not frivolous (but
9 presents a substantial question)." Because plaintiff has failed to
10 provide this court with the basis for his appeal and the reasons he
11 needs the trial transcript, the court cannot determine that his
12 appeal is not frivolous or that it presents a substantial question.
13 Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for production of transcripts at
14 government expense (#143) is **DENIED**.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 DATED: This 12th day of July, 2010.

17 
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE