

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID SAMPSON HUNTER,
Plaintiff,
v.
CAROLYN FETCH, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 18-cv-01751-MCE-KJN

ORDER

On February 19, 2019, the Court dismissed this action without further leave to amend. (ECF No. 49.) On March 18, 2019, Plaintiff, who had proceeded without counsel and in forma pauperis in the district court, filed a notice of appeal. (ECF No. 67.) Thereafter, on May 30, 2019, 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. 72.)

“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,

1 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). A plaintiff satisfies the “good faith” requirement if he or she
2 seeks review of any issue that is “not frivolous.” Gardner v. Pogue, 558 F.2d 548, 551
3 (9th Cir. 1977) (quoting Coppedge, 369 U.S. at 445).

4 For the reasons stated in the September 27, 2018 findings and recommendations
5 (see ECF No. 24), adopted by the district judge on February 19, 2019 (ECF No. 49), the
6 Court finds that the instant appeal is frivolous. The Court thus certifies that Plaintiff’s
7 appeal is not taken in good faith, and concludes that Plaintiff’s in forma pauperis status
8 should not continue for purposes of the appeal.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

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

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: May 31, 2019

15 
16 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28