

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 KEITH FORD,

11 Plaintiff,

No. 2:11-cv-1692 DAD (PC)

12 vs.

13 VALLEJO POLICE DEPARTMENT
14 DETECTIVE LES BOTTOMLEY,

15 Defendant.

ORDER

16 Plaintiff, a county jail inmate proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action
17 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 together with a request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis
18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Plaintiff, the only party to appear in this action, has consented to
19 proceed before a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

20 In his request to proceed in forma pauperis, plaintiff represents that he is not
21 employed at the jail and that he has not received any money from any source for the past twelve
22 months. The trust account statement appended to the application, however, reflects twenty-three
23 deposits to plaintiff's inmate trust account between October 3, 2010 and October 4, 2011 in
24 amounts ranging from \$19.00 to \$102.00. Good cause appearing, plaintiff will be given an
25 opportunity to explain the discrepancy between his in forma pauperis application and the trust
26 account statement appended thereto. Plaintiff shall explain the source of the cash deposits to his

1 account and whether he expects to continue to receive funds from those or any other sources.
2 Plaintiff is cautioned that Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 provides for imposition of sanctions on parties who
3 intentionally file false information with the court.

4 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within twenty days
5 from the date of this order plaintiff shall file an affidavit explaining the discrepancies between
6 his in forma pauperis application and the trust account statement appended thereto. Plaintiff's
7 failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed.

8 DATED: November 17, 2011.

9
10 
11 _____
12 DALE A. DROZD
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 ¹²

13 ford2692.ifpexpl