Rodriguez-Quezada v. Six Unknown Names Agents et al Doc. 2 Case 3:07-cv-02164-WQH-NLS Document 2 Filed 11/19/2007 Page 1 of 2

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JOSE JESUS RODRIGUEZ-QUEZADA, BOP #26664-198,	Civil No. 07-2164 WQH (NLS)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DISMISSING CASE
13 14		WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR FAILING TO PAY FILING FEES
14	VS.	PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) AND/OR MOVE TO PROCEED
16	SIX UNKNOWN NAMES AGENTS; Mr. PRESIDENT,	IN FORMA PAUPERIS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)
17	Defendants.	20 0 15 10 1 3 1 5 10 (u)
18		
19	Jose Jesus Rodriguez-Quezada ("Plaintiff"), a federal prisoner currently incarcerated at	
20	the Federal Correctional Institution in Greenville, Illinois, and proceeding prose, has filed a civil	
21	rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
22		
23	Failure to Pay Filing Fee or Request IFP Status	
24 25	Effective April 9, 2006, all parties instituting any civil action, suit or proceeding in a district court of the United States, other then a writ of behave compared must nev a filing for	
25 26	district court of the United States, other than a writ of habeas corpus, must pay a filing fee of $\$250$ . See 28 U.S.C. $\$1014(a)$ . An action may proceed despite a party's failure to pay only if	
26 27	\$350. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). An action may proceed despite a party's failure to pay only if the party is granted leave to proceed <i>in forma nauparis</i> ("IEP") pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)	
27	the party is granted leave to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> ("IFP") pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). <i>See Rodriguez v. Cook</i> , 169 F.3d 1176, 1177 (9th Cir. 1999).	
20		
	K:\COMMON\EVERYONE\_EFILE-PROSE\WQH\07cv2164-dsm-no-pay-or-IFP.wpd	07cv2164

Here, Plaintiff has neither prepaid the \$350 filing fee required to commence this action, 1 nor has he submitted a Motion to Proceed IFP. Therefore, this action is subject to immediate 2 3 dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). II. 4 5 **Conclusion and Order** For the reasons set forth above, the Court hereby: 6 7 **DISMISSES** this action sua sponte without prejudice for failing to pay the \$350 (1)8 filing fee or file a Motion to Proceed IFP pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a) and 1915(a); and 9 (2)**GRANTS** Plaintiff thirty (30) days leave from the date this Order is stamped 10 "Filed" to: (a) prepay the entire \$350 civil filing fee in full; or (b) complete and file a Motion to proceed IFP which includes a certified copy of his trust account statement for the 6-month 11 12 period preceding the filing of his Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2). 13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall provide Plaintiff with the 14 Court's approved form "Motion and Declaration in Support of Motion to Proceed In Forma *Pauperis.*" If Plaintiff fails to either prepay the \$350 civil filing fee or complete and submit the 15 16 attached Motion to Proceed IFP within that time, this action shall remain dismissed without 17 prejudice and without further Order of the Court.<sup>1</sup> 18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** DATED: November 19, 2007 19 William 2. Maues 20 WILLIAM O. HAYES 21 United States District Judge 22 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is cautioned that if he chooses to proceed with this action either by paying the full 23 civil filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a), or moving to proceed IFP, his Complaint will be subject to the mandatory screening and sua sponte dismissal provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b) and 28 U.S.C. 24 § 1915(e)(2)(b). See Lopez v. Smith, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126-27 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc) (noting that 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) "not only permits but requires" the court to sua sponte dismiss an in forma pauperis 25 complaint that fails to state a claim); see also Resnick v. Hayes, 213 F.3d 443, 446 (9th Cir. 2000) (discussing sua sponte screening required by 28 U.S.C.§ 1915A(b)). Plaintiff is further cautioned that once he accumulates three dismissals which qualify as "strikes" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), he will be precluded from proceeding *in forma pauperis* in the future unless he is in "imminent danger of serious 26 27 physical injury." See Andrews v. King, 398 F.3d 1113, 1116 n.1 (9th Cir. 2005) ("Pursuant to § 1915(g), a prisoner with three strikes," *i.e.*, prior federal cases or appeals, brought while the plaintiff was a 28 prisoner, which were dismissed on grounds that they were frivolous, malicious, or failed to state a claim, "cannot proceed IFP.").

2