

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CLINTON RANSOM, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
GARY L. LINK,
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-01494-MCE-CKD (PS)

ORDER

Plaintiffs are proceeding in this action pro se. Plaintiffs have requested authority pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 to proceed in forma pauperis. This proceeding was referred to this court by Local Rule 302(c)(21).

Plaintiffs have submitted the affidavit required by § 1915(a) showing that plaintiffs are unable to prepay fees and costs or give security for them. Accordingly, their requests to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).

The federal in forma pauperis statute authorizes federal courts to dismiss a case if the action is legally “frivolous or malicious,” fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Here, plaintiffs assert federal question jurisdiction based on the assertion that defendant committed an intentional tort, court misconduct, providing false information, business torts, fraud, among other claims. (ECF No. 1 at 4.) The federal courts are courts of limited

1 jurisdiction. In the absence of a basis for federal jurisdiction, plaintiffs' claims cannot proceed in
2 this venue. Because there is no basis for federal subject matter jurisdiction evident in the
3 complaint, plaintiffs will be ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed.
4 Failure to allege a proper basis for subject matter jurisdiction will result in a recommendation that
5 the action be dismissed.

6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. Plaintiffs' requests to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF Nos. 2 & 3) are granted;
- 8 2. No later than September 7, 2017, plaintiffs shall show cause why this action should not
9 be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

10 Dated: August 24, 2017

11 
12 _____
13 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15
16
17 14/ps.17-1494.ransom v. link.IFP OSC
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28