28

"[Section] 1915(g) should be used to deny a prisoner's [in forma pauperis] status only when, after careful evaluation of the order dismissing an action, and other relevant information, the district court determines that the action was dismissed because it was frivolous, malicious or failed to state a claim." Andrews v. King, 398 F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th Cir. 2005). "[W]hen a . . . court disposes of an in forma pauperis complaint 'on the grounds that [the claim] is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted,' such a complaint is 'dismissed' for purposes of § 1915(g) even if the . . . court styles such dismissal as denial of the prisoner's application to file the action without prepayment of the full filing fee." O'Neal v. Price, 531 F.3d 1146, 1153 (9th Cir. 2008) (second alteration in original).

Inspection of other cases filed by plaintiff has led to the identification of at least five cases that qualify as strikes.<sup>1</sup> The court takes judicial notice of the following lawsuits filed by plaintiff:<sup>2</sup>

- 1. Young v. McCargar, No. 2:00-cv-2393 GEB DAD (E.D. Cal.) (complaint dismissed on August 13, 2002, for failure to state a claim (ECF No. 33));
- 2. <u>Young v. Bowen</u>, No. 2:01-cv-6368 DSF MLG (C.D. Cal.) (second amended complaint dismissed on July 12, 2007, for failure to state a claim (ECF No. 213));
- 3. Young v. Edwards, No. 2:02-cv-2289 CAS MLG (C.D. Cal.) (complaint dismissed on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Ninth Circuit has also determined that plaintiff has accrued at least three strikes. In <u>Young v. Curliss</u>, 9th Cir. No. 13-15226, the Ninth Circuit denied plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis both because the appeal was frivolous and because plaintiff had accrued at least three strikes under § 1915(g). No. 13-15226, ECF No. 7.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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 rel. Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc.</u>, 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992) (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 accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned).

3

1

2

- 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

<sup>3</sup> Plaintiff alleges that some defendants used excessive force against him or sexually assaulted and harassed, while others failed to intervene or provide medical treatment and subsequently left him in a cold cell while only wearing boxers. ECF No. 1 at 8-15.

4. Young v. Parks, 9th Cir. No. 09-16957 (in forma pauperis status denied because the appeal was frivolous and plaintiff had three strikes under § 1915(g) (Dkt. 11),

dismissed on April 9, 2010, for failure to pay the filing fee (Dkt. 12); and

5. Young v. Curliss, 9th Cir. No. 13-15226 (in forma pauperis status denied because the appeal was frivolous and plaintiff had three strikes under § 1915(g) (Dkt. 7), dismissed on July 5, 2013, for failure to pay the filing fee (Dkt. 9)).

All of the preceding cases were dismissed well in advance of the January 30, 2024 filing of the instant action, and none of the strikes have been overturned. Therefore, this court finds that plaintiff is precluded from proceeding in forma pauperis unless he is "under imminent danger of serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). To satisfy the exception, plaintiff must have alleged facts that demonstrate that he was "under imminent danger of serious physical injury" at the time of filing the complaint. Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1053 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[I]t is the circumstances at the time of the filing of the complaint that matters for purposes of the 'imminent danger' exception to § 1915(g)."). "[T]he imminent danger exception to the PLRA three-strikes provision requires a nexus between the alleged imminent danger and the violations of law alleged in the complaint." Ray v. Lara, 31 F.4th 692, 695 (9th Cir. 2022).

The complaint alleges violations of plaintiff's constitutional rights stemming from a use of force that occurred on March 6, 2023,<sup>3</sup> and the subsequent decision to place plaintiff in administrative segregation. ECF No. 1 at 8-18. There are no allegations that would demonstrate an imminent risk of serious physical injury at the time of filing, and the undersigned will therefore recommend that plaintiff be required to pay the filing fee in full or have the complaint dismissed.

## II. Plain Language Summary of this Order for a Pro Se Litigant

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

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

## IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) be DENIED; and
- 2. Plaintiff be ordered to pay the entire \$405.00 in required fees within thirty days or face dismissal of the case.

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, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

DATED: February 7, 2024

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE