

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, et al.,)	No. C 10-1105 MMC (PR)
Petitioners.)	ORDER OF DISMISSAL
v.)	
THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA, et al.,)	
Respondents.)	

On March 15, 2010, petitioner, a prisoner incarcerated in Bishopville, South Carolina, filed, on behalf of himself and more than forty other prisoners, the above-titled petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. That same date, the Court notified petitioner in writing that the action was deficient due to petitioner’s failure to pay the requisite filing fee or, instead, to submit a completed court-approved in forma pauperis (“IFP”) application. Petitioner was further advised that his failure to pay the filing fee or, alternatively, to file a completed IFP application, within thirty days, would result in dismissal of the action. Along with said notice, petitioner was sent a copy of the court-approved prisoner’s IFP application, instructions for completing it, and a return envelope.

More than thirty days have passed since the deficiency notice was sent to petitioner and he has not filed an IFP application or paid the filing fee. Accordingly, the above-titled

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 action is hereby DISMISSED without prejudice.¹

2 The Clerk shall close the file.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: April 23, 2010


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ¹On April 9, 2010, the court received a letter from petitioner in which he requests
28 additional IFP applications for his more than forty co-petitioners. The petition, however, has
not been signed by any co-petitioner, and petitioner may not proceed on behalf of other
prisoners. Consequently, the request is denied.