Hiramanek et al v		Clark et al	Doc
United States District Court For the Northern District of California	1		
	2		
	2		
	4		
	5		
	6		
	7		
	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
	9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
	10	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
	11		
	12	ADIL K HIRAMANEK and RODA K HIRAMANEK,	Case No. 13-00228
	13	Plaintiffs,	ORDER REVOKING IN FORMA
	14	v.	PAUPERIS STATUS FOR APPEAL
	15	L. MICHAEL CLARK, et al.,	[Re Docket No. 170]
	16	Defendants.	
	17		
	18		
	19	Per the referral of the Ninth Circuit, Dkt. No. 170, the court finds that Appeal No. 14-17056	
	20	is not taken in good faith under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). The court's order denying a preliminary	
	21	injunction, Dkt. No. 164, is based on the denial of plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend the	
	22	complaint. Without leave to amend, there are no claims supporting the requested preliminary	
	23	injunction. Because the appellate court will not review the denial of the motion for leave, see Dkt.	
	24	No. 171, there is nothing to review regarding the denial of the preliminary injunction. Accordingly,	
	25	the appeal is not taken in good faith and the court revokes plaintiffs' in forma pauperis status for	
	26	Appeal No. 14-17056.	

IT IS SO ORDERED.

27

28

ORDER Case No. 13-CV-00228-RMW LM 173

Dated: October 27, 2014

Ronald M. Whyte United States District Judge

United States District Court For the Northern District of California