In 2016, the Magistrate Judge dismissed plaintiff Kevin King's complaint with leave to amend under the screening provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. ECF No. 11. Plaintiff requested and received extensions to his deadline to file an amended complaint, but he did not ultimately amend his complaint, and the Magistrate Judge recommended dismissing this action without prejudice. *See* F&Rs, ECF No. 30. Plaintiff did not object, and this court adopted the Magistrate Judge's recommendation in 2017. *See* Order, ECF No. 31; Judgment, ECF No. 32. Meanwhile, plaintiff's appeal of the Magistrate Judge's screening order was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *See* ECF Nos. 21, 22, 28, 29. Plaintiff now requests clarification why he is "required to pay a filing fee for an appeal that [he] never officially filed." ECF No. 33. This court cannot grant relief related to plaintiff's appeal, and contrary to his motion, the appeal was filed. *See, e.g.*, Appeal Information, ECF No. 22-1.

The motion for clarification (ECF No. 33) is **denied**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: January 23, 2024.

3

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE