1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	Keenan Wilkins,	No. 2:16-cv-00347-KJM-KJN
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER
13	V.	
14	Paul Gonzalez, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed this civil rights action without counsel in February 2016.	
18	This court revoked plaintiff's in forma pauperis (IFP) status on March 14, 2018, and ordered him	
19	to pay a \$400.00 filing fee within thirty days. Order, ECF No. 61, at 3. Plaintiff did not pay the	
20	filing fee, nor did he show good cause, and so this action was dismissed. Dismissal Order, ECF	
21	No. 68. Plaintiff subsequently petitioned the Ninth Circuit for a writ of mandamus, which was	
22	"denied without prejudice to petitioner seeking whatever relief may be available in the district	
23	court in light of Meyers v. Birdsong, 83 F.4th 1157, 1160-61 (9th Cir. 2023)." Ninth Circuit	
24	Order, ECF No. 76. Plaintiff now files this motion for relief under Rule 60 and the Ninth	
25	Circuit's Order, asking for a "refund of all fees col	llected in this action as he was not allowed to
25 26		
	Circuit's Order, asking for a "refund of all fees col	

1

1 In Meyers v. Birdsong, the court held "§ 1915(b) neither permits nor requires the 2 collection of fees from a struck-out prisoner who attempts to file an appeal IFP," and "directed 3 the Clerk of the District Court to return any fees that it collected on [the court's] behalf for [the] 4 appeal." Meyers, 83 F.4th at 1161. Here, plaintiff's request does not include sufficient 5 information or evidence to establish a successful claim for a refund, such as evidence of the funds 6 withdrawn or subject to future withdrawal from his account or evidence the court has ordered the 7 withdrawal of the funds. See Mot. at 1–6. Accordingly, the motion is **denied without prejudice**. This order resolves ECF No. 77. 8

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: December 7, 2023.

JUDGE CHIEF