

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3

4 TERRY CRANFORD,
5 Plaintiff,

No. C 09-03254 SBA (PR)

ORDER REGARDING
IN FORMA PAUPERIS MOTION

6 v.

7 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
8 CORRECTIONS, et al.,
9 Defendants.

10
11 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed this pro se civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He has
12 also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP). However, Plaintiff filed a Notice of
13 Change of Address requesting the Clerk of the Court to forward all documents to 600 Morgan Street,
14 Santa Rosa, California 95403, which the Court assumes is his home address because Plaintiff does
15 not specify that he was transferred to another institution.

16 Ordinarily, a plaintiff is permitted to file a civil action in federal court without prepayment of
17 fees or security if he alleges in an affidavit that he is unable to pay such fees or give security
18 therefor. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). But if the plaintiff is a prisoner who alleges that he is unable to
19 pay the full filing fee at the time of filing, he will be required to pay the full amount of the filing fee
20 even if he is granted IFP status. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). This is done by way of an "installment
21 plan," whereby the court will assess an initial payment, and the prisoner will be required thereafter
22 to make monthly payments of twenty percent of the preceding month's income credited to the
23 prisoner's account. See id. However, if a prisoner who seeks leave to proceed IFP is released from
24 prison while his action is pending, he will not be required to pay the full filing fee if IFP status is
25 granted. See, e.g., DeBlasio v. Gilmore, 315 F.3d 396, 399 (4th Cir. 2003) (statutory language,
26 legislative intent and policy reasons dictate that prisoner granted IFP status when he filed action
27 would not be liable for full amount of filing fee upon release but must be allowed to apply to
28 proceed under general IFP provisions of § 1915(a)(1)); McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601,
613 (6th Cir.

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

1997) (same); McGann v. Comm'r, Soc. Sec. Admin., 96 F.3d 28, 29-30 (2d Cir. 1996) (same).

Because Plaintiff no longer is incarcerated, in order for the Court to assess whether he is entitled to proceed IFP he must apply to proceed IFP under the general provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). The Court will not rely upon any prior IFP application filed by Plaintiff while he was incarcerated to make the IFP determination in this action. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed IFP is TERMINATED as moot. Plaintiff shall either pay the \$350.00 filing fee or file a new non-prisoner IFP application. If, based upon the information provided by Plaintiff, the Court grants Plaintiff leave to proceed IFP, the Court will proceed to review the complaint under § 1915(e)(2).¹ If the Court determines that Plaintiff is not entitled to IFP status, he will be required to pay the full filing fee or the action will be dismissed.


Accordingly, Plaintiff is hereby ORDERED to file a non-prisoner application to proceed IFP. Plaintiff shall answer all questions and shall include Plaintiff's name and case number C 09-03254 SBA (PR) on the attached application. Plaintiff shall file his completed application within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.

The Clerk of the Court shall send Plaintiff a blank non-prisoner IFP application form along with a copy of this Order.

The Court reminds Plaintiff it is his responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the court and all parties informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper captioned "Notice of Change of Address." He must comply with the Court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

Failure to file a completed non-prisoner IFP application form as ordered herein by the thirty-day deadline shall result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



¹ Under this section, the Court is required to conduct a preliminary screening for frivolity, failure to state a claim, or immune defendants in any IFP action.

1 DATED: 11/16/09

SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
United States District Judge

2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 FOR THE
4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

5 TERRY CRAWFORD,
6 Plaintiff,

Case Number: CV09-03254 SBA

7 v.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

8 CA DEPT OF CORRECTIONS et al,
9 Defendant.

10
11 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
12 Court, Northern District of California.

13 That on November 18, 2009, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
14 copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said
15 envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle
16 located in the Clerk's office.

16 Terry D. Cranford
17 600 Morgan Street
18 Santa Rosa, CA 95403

18 Dated: November 18, 2009

19 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
20 By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28