

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TAJAI CALIP,
Plaintiff.

v.

OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT,
Defendant.

Case No. [15-cv-00877-SI](#)

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN
FORMA PAUPERIS AND DENYING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

Re: Dkt. No. 10, 15, 18

On April 28, 2015, defendant Oakland Unified School District filed a motion to dismiss this case based on plaintiff's failure to comply with court orders directing plaintiff to file an amended complaint and an amended application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. However, on April 27, 2015, plaintiff filed an amended complaint and an amended application to proceed *in forma pauperis*; those documents were entered onto the docket on April 28, 2015. The docket reflects that on April 27, 2015, plaintiff filed a notice of her correct address, and that prior to that date numerous documents and court orders sent to plaintiff had been returned as undeliverable.

The Court has reviewed the amended application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and finds that plaintiff has added the information that was missing from the original application. Having considered the amended application and amended complaint, the Court hereby **GRANTS** plaintiff's application. The Clerk of Court shall issue the summons. Furthermore, the U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of California shall serve, without prepayment of fees, a copy of the amended complaint, any amendments or attachments, plaintiff's affidavit and this order upon defendant.

The Court notes that plaintiff filed an opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss in which she discusses difficulties she has experienced representing herself in this case. The Court advises

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

plaintiff that assistance is available at the Northern District's Pro Se Help Desk (415-782-8982),
and see also <http://cand.uscourts.gov/helpcentersf>.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 2, 2015



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff also states that she has requested that this case be transferred to the Oakland Division. The Court informs plaintiff that pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(d), "all civil actions which arise in the counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo or Sonoma shall be assigned to the San Francisco Division or the Oakland Division," and thus the Court is unfortunately not able to accommodate plaintiff's request.