

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 JASPER BAILEY,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 SANTA CLARA COUNTY SUPERIOR
11 COURT,

12 Defendant.

Case No. [21-cv-00279-HSG](#)

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
CORRECTION**

Re: Dkt. No. 52

13 Plaintiff, an inmate at Correctional Training Facility in Soledad, California, has filed a *pro*
14 *se* action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 25, 2021, the Court dismissed the action as
15 barred by the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, and entered judgment in favor of Defendants. Dkt. Nos.
16 16, 18. Plaintiff has appealed the dismissal. Dkt. Nos. 23, 30. Now pending before the Court is
17 Plaintiff's motion titled "Error for Correction," wherein he requests that the Court return \$505.00
18 to his prison trust account. Dkt. No. 52. Plaintiff correctly notes that, on September 23, 2021, the
19 Court received \$350.00 from Plaintiff, Dkt. No. 24, and that, on October 5, 2021, the Court
20 received \$155.00 from Plaintiff, Dkt. No. 47 at 2. Plaintiff argues that these monies should be
21 returned to him because they were intended to pay the filing fee for his appeal and incorrectly
22 applied here; and because these monies came from stimulus payments paid to him under the
23 CARES Act which cannot be deducted to satisfy court filing fee obligations.¹ Dkt. No. 52 at 1-2.
24 Plaintiff's request is DENIED. The September 23, 2021 \$350.00 payment was properly applied to
25 satisfy Plaintiff's filing fee obligation for this action.² The October 5, 2021 \$155.00 payment was

26
27 ¹ Plaintiff initiated and authorized these payments. Dkt. Nos. 41, 47. The Court did not deduct
these monies from Plaintiff's account.


28 ² Because Plaintiff was granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, he does not need to pay the
\$52 administrative fee.

1 properly applied as a partial payment to satisfy Plaintiff's filing fee obligation for his appeal, C
2 No. 21-cv-015786-001. The Court is unaware of any prohibition on applying stimulus funds to
3 satisfy court filing fees. The relevant executive order, Executive Order N-57-20, does not
4 reference court filing fees.

5 This order terminates Dkt. No. 52. This case remains closed.³

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 Dated: 1/7/2022

8 
9 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
10 United States District Judge

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
United States District Court
Northern District of California

26 _____
27 ³ Of the 52 docket entries in this case, 44 are filed by Plaintiff. The majority of these pleadings do
28 not seek court action and only serve to clutter the record. Plaintiff need not and should not file
"acknowledgment of receipts" with the Court. These filings clutter the record and delay the Court
from ruling upon meritorious motions. Plaintiff is advised to be more judicious in the pleadings
he files with the Court.