I

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6 7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	TAI TRUONG,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-08-2831 MCE DAD P
12	VS.
13	MARTIN HOSHINO, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	Plaintiff has filed an appeal from this court's dismissal of the action. On January
17	28, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. <sup>1</sup> The motion will be
18	denied without prejudice so that plaintiff may file his motion directly with the U.S. Court of
19	Appeals for the Ninth Circuit using the form provided by that court.
20	/////
21	////
22	////
23	////
24	<sup>1</sup> On October 29, 2009, plaintiff's March 9, 2009 application to proceed in forma
25	pauperis was denied without prejudice because it was incomplete. In addition, the filing fee was paid in this court by defendant Hoshino when the action was removed from the Sacramento
26	County Superior Court.
	1

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's January 28, 2010
2	motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. No. 25) is denied without prejudice.
3	DATED: February 10, 2010.
4	
5	Dale A. Drogat DALE A. DROZD
6	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7	DAD:4 tru2831.ifp
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2