Ш

1	
2	
2	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	MARVIN HARRIS, No. CIV S-11-2175-KJM-CMK-P
12	Plaintiff,
13	vs. <u>AMENDED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
14	M. DELONEY, et al.,
15	Defendants.
16	/
17	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to
18	42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma
19	pauperis (Doc. 7), which the court recommends be denied.
20	The PLRA's "three strikes" provision, found at 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), provides as
21	follows:
22	In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action under this section if the prisoner has, on three or more prior occasions, while
23	incarcerated or detained, brought an action in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the ground that it is frivolous, malicious, or
24	fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.
25	Id.
26	
	1

Thus, when a prisoner plaintiff has had three or more prior actions dismissed for one of the
reasons set forth in the statute, such "strikes" preclude the prisoner from proceeding in forma
pauperis unless the imminent danger exception applies. Dismissed habeas petitions do not count
as "strikes" under § 1915(g). See Andrews v. King, 398 F.3d 1113, 1122 (9th Cir. 2005).
Where, however, a dismissed habeas action was merely a disguised civil rights action, the district
court may conclude that it counts as a "strike." See id. at n.12.

In this case, plaintiff has three or more "strikes." As outlined in the court's order
in <u>Harris v. Brooks</u>, E. Dist. Cal. no. CIV-S-09-1818-DAD-P, at least the following three cases
were dismissed on the grounds that they were frivolous or failed to state a claim upon which
relief could be granted: (1) <u>Harris v. Edmonds</u>, no. CIV-F-5857-OWW-LJO; (2) <u>Harris v.</u>
<u>Edmonds</u>, no. CIV-F-00-7160-REC-SMS; and (3) <u>Harris v. Pliler</u>, no. CIV-S-01-1125-WBSDAD. Because plaintiff has three or more "strikes," his motion for in forma pauperis status must
be denied.

14 When in forma pauperis status is denied or revoked under 1915(g), the proper 15 course of action is to dismiss the action without prejudice to re-filing the action upon pre-16 payment of fees at the time the action is re-filed. In Tierney v. Kupers, the Ninth Circuit 17 reviewed a district court's screening stage dismissal of a prisoner civil rights action after finding under § 1915(g) that the plaintiff was not entitled to proceed in forma pauperis. See 128 F.3d 18 19 1310 (9th Cir. 1998). Notably, the district court dismissed the entire action rather than simply 20 providing the plaintiff an opportunity to pay the filing fee. The Ninth Circuit held that the 21 plaintiff's case was "properly dismissed." Id. at 1311. Similarly, in Rodriguez v. Cook, the 22 Ninth Circuit dismissed an inmate's appeal in a prisoner civil rights action because it concluded 23 that he was not entitled to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal pursuant to the "three strikes" 24 provision. See 169 F.3d 1176 (9th Cir. 1999). Again, rather than providing the inmate appellant 25 an opportunity to pay the filing fee, the court dismissed the appeal without prejudice and stated 26 that the appellant "may resume this appeal upon prepaying the filing fee."

1	This conclusion is consistent with the conclusions reached in at least three other
2	circuits. In Dupree v. Palmer, the Eleventh Circuit held that denial of in forma pauperis status
3	under § 1915(g) mandated dismissal. See 284 F.3d 1234 (11th Cir. 2002). The court specifically
4	held that "the prisoner cannot simply pay the filing fee after being denied IFP status" because
5	"[h]e must pay the filing fee at the time he <i>initiates</i> the suit." <u>Id.</u> at 1236 (emphasis in original).
6	The Fifth and Sixth Circuits follow the same rule. See Adepegba v. Hammons, 103 F.3d 383
7	(5th Cir. 1996); <u>In re Alea</u> , 86 F.3d 378 (6th Cir. 2002).
8	Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that:
9	1. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 7) be
10	denied; and
11	2. This action be dismissed without prejudice.
12	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
13	Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within 14 days
14	after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
15	objections with the court. Responses to objections shall be filed within 14 days after service of
16	objections. Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal.
17	See Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
18	
19	DATED: September 12, 2011
20	Lraig M. Kellison
21	CRAIG M. KELLISON UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	3