	Case 2:21-cv-01236-TLN-AC Documer	nt 4 Filed 07/19/21 Page 1 of 4	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN I	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10			
11	MELVIN JOSEPH SIMMONS,	No. 2:21-cv-1236 AC P	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	V.	ORDER AND FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
14	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, et al.,		
15	Defendants.		
16			
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding	pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42	
18	U.S.C. § 1983.		
19 20	I. <u>Three Strikes Analysis</u>		
20 21	Plaintiff has not yet submitted an application to proceed in forma pauperis in this case or		
21	paid the required filing fee of \$350.00 plus the \$52.00 administrative fee. However, as explained		
22	below, plaintiff will not be given the opportunity to submit an application to proceed in forma		
24	pauperis because he has accrued at least three strikes under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and he has not		
25	shown that he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. Accordingly, the court will		
26	recommend that plaintiff be required to pay the \$402.00 in required fees or suffer dismissal of the		
27	complaint.		
28			

	Case 2:21-cv-01236-TLN-AC Document 4 Filed 07/19/21 Page 2 of 4
1	The Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (PLRA) permits any court of the United States
2	to authorize the commencement and prosecution of any suit without prepayment of fees by a
3	person who submits an affidavit indicating that the person is unable to pay such fees. However,
4	[i]n no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a
5	judgement in a civil action or proceeding under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more occasions, while incarcerated or detained
6	in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous,
7	malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical
8	injury.
9	28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The plain language of the statute makes clear that a prisoner is precluded
10	from bringing a civil action or an appeal in forma pauperis if the prisoner has brought three
11	frivolous actions and/or appeals (or any combination thereof totaling three). Rodriguez v. Cook,
12	169 F.3d 1176, 1178 (9th Cir. 1999). "[Section] 1915(g) should be used to deny a prisoner's [in
13	forma pauperis] status only when, after careful evaluation of the order dismissing an action, and
14	other relevant information, the district court determines that the action was dismissed because it
15	was frivolous, malicious or failed to state a claim." <u>Andrews v. King</u> , 398 F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th
16	Cir. 2005). "[W]hen a district court disposes of an in forma pauperis complaint 'on the grounds
17	that [the claim] is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted,'
18	such a complaint is 'dismissed' for purposes of § 1915(g) even if the district court styles such
19	dismissal as denial of the prisoner's application to file the action without prepayment of the full
20	filing fee." O'Neal v. Price, 531 F.3d 1146, 1153 (9th Cir. 2008) (second alteration in original).
21	Dismissal also counts as a strike under § 1915(g) "when (1) a district court dismisses a complaint
22	on the ground that it fails to state a claim, (2) the court grants leave to amend, and (3) the plaintiff
23	then fails to file an amended complaint" regardless of whether the case was dismissed with or
24	without prejudice. <u>Harris v. Mangum</u> , 863 F.3d 1133, 1142-43 (9th Cir. 2017).
25	Inspection of other cases filed by plaintiff has led to the identification of at least three
26	cases brought by plaintiff that qualify as strikes. The court takes judicial notice of the following
27	////
28	////
	2

	Case 2:21-cv-01236-TLN-AC Document 4 Filed 07/19/21 Page 3 of 4	
1	lawsuits filed by plaintiff: ¹	
2	1. Simmons v. Giurbino, N.D. Cal. No. 3:11-cv-2169 WHA (case dismissed for failure to	
3	state a claim on June 1, 2011 (ECF No. 4))	
4	2. Simmons v. Kernon, N.D. Cal. No. 5:16-cv-7319 LHK (case dismissed for failure to	
5	state a claim on July 25, 2017 (ECF No. 28))	
6	3. Simmons v. State of California, N.D. Cal. No. 5:17-cv-5595 LHK (complaint	
7	dismissed with leave to amend for failure to state a claim (ECF No. 6), case dismissed	
8	on January 24, 2018, for failure to file an amended complaint (ECF No. 7))	
9	All of the preceding cases were dismissed in advance of the July 8, 2021 ² filing of the	
10	instant action, and none of the strikes have been overturned. Therefore, this court finds that	
11	plaintiff is precluded from proceeding in forma pauperis unless he is "under imminent danger of	
12	serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). To satisfy the exception, plaintiff must have	
13	alleged facts that demonstrate that he was "under imminent danger of serious physical injury" at	
14	the time of filing the complaint. Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1053 (9th Cir. 2007)	
15	("[I]t is the circumstances at the time of the filing of the complaint that matters for purposes of	
16	the 'imminent danger' exception to § 1915(g)."); see also, Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie, 239 F.3d	
17	307, 312-14 (3rd Cir. 2001); Medberry v. Butler, 185 F.3d 1189, 1192-93 (11th Cir. 1999);	
18	Ashley v. Dilworth, 147 F.3d 715, 717 (8th Cir. 1998); Banos v. O'Guin, 144 F.3d 883, 885 (5th	
19	Cir. 1998).	
20	The complaint is largely unintelligible but appears to relate to alleged infringements on	
21	plaintiff's unspecified intellectual property. ECF No. 1. There are no allegations that would	
22		
23	¹ The court "may take notice of proceedings in other courts, both within and without the federal judicial system, if those proceedings have a direct relation to matters at issue." <u>United States ex</u>	
24	rel. Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc., 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992)	
25	(citation and internal quotation marks omitted) (collecting cases); Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)(2) (court may take judicial notice of facts that are capable of accurate determination by sources whose	
26	accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned). ² Since plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se, he is afforded the benefit of the prison mailbox	
27	rule. Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988) (establishing rule that a prisoner's court	
28	document is deemed filed on the date the prisoner delivered the document to prison officials for mailing).	
	3	

Case 2:21-cv-01236-TLN-AC Document 4 Filed 07/19/21 Page 4 of 4

1 demonstrate an imminent risk of serious physical injury at the time of filing, and the undersigned 2 will therefore recommend that plaintiff be required to pay the filing fee in full or have the 3 complaint dismissed.

4

II.

Plain Language Summary of this Order for a Pro Se Litigant

5 You have at least three strikes under \S 1915(g) and cannot be granted in forma pauperis 6 status unless you show the court that you were in imminent danger of serious physical injury at 7 the time you filed the complaint. You have not shown that you were in imminent danger of 8 serious physical injury and so it is being recommended that your motion to proceed in forma 9 pauperis be denied and you be required to pay the whole filing fee at one time.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall randomly 11 assign a United States District Judge to this action.

12

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that plaintiff be ordered to pay the entire \$402.00 in 13 required fees within thirty days or face dismissal of the case.

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge 14 15 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days 16 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections 17 with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings 18 and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified 19 time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 20 (9th Cir. 1991).

21 DATED: July 19, 2021

cum Clan

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

4