

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBIN GILLEN STARR,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-11-3038 GGH P

vs.

JEFF REISIG, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case is before the undersigned pursuant to plaintiff's consent. Docket # 10. On December 2, 2011, plaintiff was ordered to file an in forma pauperis application. Plaintiff's in forma pauperis application was incomplete, so on January 5, 2012, the court ordered plaintiff to submit a completed application, yet that order was returned to the court as undeliverable. Plaintiff then filed a motion for default judgment, motion to compel, motion to reconsider the order denying appointment of counsel and motion for summary judgment. Docs. 13-17. However, as the case had not been screened yet and no defendants had been served, these motions were all vacated as premature. On January 23, 2012, plaintiff was given another opportunity to submit a proper in forma pauperis application within 30 days. Plaintiff has not filed an in forma pauperis application, yet has filed several more motions that are once again

1 premature and frivolous. Plaintiff has been given three different opportunities to file an in forma
2 pauperis application but has failed to follow the court's orders. Therefore, this case is
3 dismissed.¹

4 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. Plaintiff's motions (Docs. 21 & 22) are vacated;
- 6 2. This action is dismissed. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

7 DATED: March 23, 2012

8 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 GGH: AB
11 star3038.dis

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

¹ While an earlier order was returned to the court as undeliverable, the other mailings ordering plaintiff to file an in forma pauperis application have not been returned to the court.