

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

Ciron B. Springfield,

Plaintiff,

v.

C. Fiber, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:18-cv-01063-KJM-DMC

ORDER

Plaintiff Ciron B. Springfield moves for reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge’s order denying his request to reimburse the filing fee he paid to pursue an appeal in this action. *See* Mot. Reimburse, ECF No. 43; Order, ECF No. 44; Mot. Recons., ECF No. 45. Because this action has been settled and is closed, and because Mr. Springfield seeks post-judgment relief, the court construes the Magistrate Judge’s order as findings and recommendations and Mr. Springfield’s motion as objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)–(B); E.D. Cal. L.R. 302(c)(21). The court has considered Mr. Springfield’s motion and the record de novo.

The court may assume without deciding that it has authority to consider a motion to reimburse a filing fee paid to begin an appeal. The Magistrate Judge correctly determined that 28 U.S.C. § 1915 requires incarcerated plaintiffs who bring civil actions or file appeals *in forma pauperis* “to pay the full amount of a filing fee” notwithstanding this court’s power to “authorize

1 the commencement, prosecution, or defense of any suit, action or proceeding . . . without
2 prepayment of fees.” See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), (b)(1). The motion for a rebate is **denied**, and
3 the objections to the Magistrate Judge’s decision are **overruled**.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: February 25, 2022.

6



CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE