4

7

6

9

8

10 11

13

14

12

15 16

17

/////

/////

/////

/////

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

14.

2

litigant for purposes of § 1915(g)¹ and plaintiff's complaint fails to allege facts that adequately demonstrate he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.² Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis must therefore be denied pursuant to § 1915(g). Plaintiff must submit the appropriate filing fee in order to proceed with this action.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court randomly assign a United States District Judge to this action.

Further, because plaintiff has not paid the filing fee and is not eligible to proceed in forma pauperis, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 4) be denied; and
- 2. Plaintiff be ordered to pay the \$400 filing fee within fourteen days from the date of any order adopting these findings and recommendations and be admonished that failure to do so will result in the dismissal of this action.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objections

² To meet his burden under § 1915(g) to adequately allege "imminent danger of serious physical injury," plaintiff must provide "specific fact allegations of ongoing serious physical injury, or a pattern of misconduct evidencing the likelihood of imminent serious physical injury." Martin v. Shelton, 319 F.3d 1048, 1050 (8th Cir. 2003). "Vague and utterly conclusory assertions" of harm are insufficient. White v. Colorado, 157 F.3d 1226, 1231-32 (10th Cir. 1998). That is, the "imminent danger" exception is available "for genuine emergencies," where "time is pressing" and "a threat . . . is real and proximate." Lewis v. Sullivan, 279 F.3d 526, 531 (7th Cir. 2002).

¹ See Brown v. Sagireddy, No. 2:17-cv-2041-KJM-AC (E.D. Cal. May 2, 2018), ECF No.

1	within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. <i>Turner v</i> .
2	Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
3	Dated: October 10, 2018.
4	Elmund F. Biems
5	EĎMUND F. BRĚNNAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
1617	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	