1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	LONNIE M. WILLIAMS-TURNER,	No. 2:17-cv-1481-JAM-EFB P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v .	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
14	MOGHADDAM, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42	
18	U.S.C. § 1983. She seeks leave to proceed in forma pauperis. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). For the	
19	reasons explained below, the court finds that plaintiff has not demonstrated that she is eligible to	
20	proceed in forma pauperis.	
21	A prisoner may not proceed in forma pauperis:	
22	1 , 1	occasions, while incarcerated or detained in eal in a court of the United States that was
23	any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim	
24	serious physical injury.	less the prisoner is under imminent danger of
25		
26	28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Court records reflect that on at least three prior occasions, plaintiff has	
27	brought actions while incarcerated that were dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to	
28	state a claim upon which relief may be grante	ed. See, e.g., Williams v. Lopez, No. 2:16-cv-0131-
		1

KJM-KJN (E.D. Cal. June 7, 2016) (identifying plaintiff as a three-strikes litigant and denying
plaintiff's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis).

3 The section 1915(g) exception applies if the complaint makes a plausible allegation that 4 the prisoner faced "imminent danger of serious physical injury" at the time of filing. 28 U.S.C. 5 § 1915(g); Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1055 (9th Cir. 2007). In this case, plaintiff 6 alleges that from August 24, 2012, to the date of filing, she has been poisoned on a daily basis 7 with arsenic/nitrites, and that on an unspecified date, various defendants discontinued her 8 prescription pain medication in retaliation for her complaints about the poisoning. ECF No. 1 at 9 4.¹ She attaches urinalysis reports from 2012 through 2016, documenting positive results for 10 nitrites in her urine. Id. at 5-14. She claims that the poisoning is destroying her vital organs, and 11 causing cancer, post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and pain. *Id.* at 15.

12 Plaintiff has been alleging arsenic poisoning since 2006 and courts in this district have 13 repeatedly determined that her allegations are simply not plausible and do not meet the imminent 14 danger exception. See, e.g., Williams, 2:16-cv-0131-KJM-KJN (E.D. Cal.), ECF Nos. 8 & 11; 15 Williams v. Macomber, 2:15-cv-2268-MCE-KJN (E.D. Cal.), ECF Nos. 10 & 13; Williams v. 16 Norton, 2:12-cv-2889-CKD (E.D. Cal.), ECF No. 4; Williams v. Bauer, 2:12-cv-2158-MCE-EFB 17 (E.D. Cal.), ECF Nos. 12 & 14; Williams v. Wedell, 2:12-cv-1438-GEB-GGH (E.D. Cal.), ECF 18 Nos. 12 & 14; Williams v. CDCR, 2:12-cv-1616-JAM-EFB (E.D. Cal.), ECF Nos. 7 & 9; 19 Williams v. Willie, 2:11-cv-1532-MCE-DAD (E.D. Cal.), ECF Nos. 15 & 22; Williams v. Gomez, 20 2:11-cv-426-GEB-EFB (E.D. Cal.), ECF Nos. 40 & 45; Williams v. Murray, 2:11-cv-0069-MCE-21 JFM (E.D. Cal.), ECF No. 9. The instant complaint is no different in that it does not plausibly 22 demonstrate that plaintiff is in imminent danger of serious physical injury. Plaintiff's application 23 for leave to proceed in forma pauperis must therefore be denied pursuant to § 1915(g). Plaintiff 24 must submit the appropriate filing fee in order to proceed with this action. 25 /////

26 /////

27

¹ This and subsequent page number citations to plaintiff's complaint are to the page number reflected on the court's CM/ECF system and not to page numbers assigned by plaintiff.

1	Accordingly, because plaintiff has not paid the filing fee and is not eligible to proceed in		
2	forma pauperis, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:		
3	1. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) be denied; and		
4	2. Plaintiff be ordered to pay the filing fee within fourteen days of any order adopting		
5	these findings and recommendations.		
6	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge		
7	assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days		
8	after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written		
9	objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned		
10	"Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objections		
11	within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Turner v.		
12	Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).		
13	Dated: May 15, 2018.		
14	Elmind Fibieman		
15	EĎMUND F. BRĚNNAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	3		