

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

CHRISTOPHER LAWRENCE
BRADLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY MILLER, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-1834-MCE-KJN PS

ORDER

On December 6, 2017, the court dismissed this action with prejudice. (ECF Nos. 12, 13.) On January 3, 2018, plaintiff, who had proceeded without counsel and *in forma pauperis* in the district court, filed a notice of appeal. (ECF No. 17.) Thereafter, on January 26, 2018, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals referred this matter to the district court for the limited purpose of determining whether *in forma pauperis* status should continue for the appeal, or whether the appeal is frivolous or taken in bad faith. (ECF No. 22.)

“An appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); see also Hooker v. American Airlines, 302 F.3d 1091, 1092 (9th Cir. 2002) (revocation of *in forma pauperis* status appropriate where district court finds the appeal to be frivolous). The good faith standard under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 is an objective one. Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). A plaintiff satisfies the

1 “good faith” requirement if he or she seeks review of any issue that is “not frivolous.” Gardner v.
2 Pogue, 558 F.2d 548, 551 (9th Cir. 1977) (quoting Coppedge, 369 U.S. at 445).


3 For the reasons stated in the November 8, 2017 findings and recommendations (see ECF
4 No. 8), adopted by the district judge on December 6, 2017 (ECF No. 12), the court finds that the
5 instant appeal is frivolous. The court thus certifies that plaintiff’s appeal is not taken in good
6 faith, and concludes that plaintiff’s *in forma pauperis* status should not continue for purposes of
7 the appeal.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 9 1. Plaintiff’s *in forma pauperis* status is REVOKED.
- 10 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to serve a copy of this order on plaintiff and on the
11 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: January 30, 2018

14 
15 _____
16 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28