IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEROME L. GRIMES, Plaintiff, v. DEPUTY CROFT, et al., Defendants.	No. C 13-3980 JSW (PR) **ORDER OF DISMISSAL** (Docket No. 2, 5)

Plaintiff, an inmate in the San Francisco County Jail and frequent litigator in this Court, has recently filed this pro se civil rights case. On May 18, 2000, this Court informed Plaintiff that under the "three-strikes" provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) he generally is ineligible to proceed *in forma pauperis* in federal court with civil actions filed while he is incarcerated. *See Grimes v. Oakland Police Dept.*, C 00-1100 CW (Order Dismissing Complaint, 5/18/00). Since then, Plaintiff has continued to file hundreds of civil rights actions seeking *in forma pauperis* status. With respect to each action filed, the Court conducts a preliminary review to assess the nature of the allegations and to determine whether Plaintiff alleges facts which bring him within the "imminent danger of serious physical injury" exception to § 1915(g). In the past, Plaintiff has routinely been granted leave to amend to pay the full filing fee and to state cognizable claims for relief, but he has habitually failed to do so. For example, in 2003 alone Plaintiff's failure to comply resulted in the dismissal of approximately thirty-six actions under § 1915(g).

In accord with this ongoing practice, the Court has reviewed the allegations in the present action and finds that Plaintiff alleges no facts which bring him within the "imminent danger" clause. The complaint makes a number of highly implausible or unintelligible allegations, such as “pop top valve cover theft 1986 in the commission of Penal Code: 664/187, Holloween Eve, 2010 . . . premeditated by state actor co-fences.” On numerous occasions, Plaintiff has been informed that allegations such as these neither establish imminent danger nor state cognizable claims for relief. Therefore, it would be futile to grant Plaintiff leave to amend.

Accordingly, this case is DISMISSED without prejudice under § 1915(g). The application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is DENIED. No fee is due. If Plaintiff is so inclined, he may bring his claims in a new action accompanied by the $400.00 filing fee. In any event, the Court will continue to review under § 1915(g) all future actions filed by Plaintiff while he is incarcerated in which he seeks *in forma pauperis* status.

The Clerk of the Court shall close the files and terminate all pending motions in the cases listed in the caption of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 2, 2013

JEFFREY S. WHITE
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEROME GRIMES,

Plaintiff,

v.

CROFT et al,

Defendant.

_____/

Case Number: CV13-03980 JSW

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on October 2, 2013, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.

Jerome L. Grimes
San Francisco County Jail #3
850 Bryant Street, 6th Floor
#13672741 #408761
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dated: October 2, 2013

Jennifer Ottolini

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk