Pittman v. Pearson et al Doc. 2

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 WILBUR LANN PITTMAN, 09-0931 IEG (PCL) Civil No. CDCR #F-64353, 12 Plaintiff, 13 TION WITHOUT PREJUDICE R FAILING TO PAY VS. 14 ING FEE REOUIRED BY 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) AND/OR 15 D. PEARSON; FAILING TO MOVE TO PROCEED MERCER; *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* 16 P. FLORST, **PURSUANT TO** 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) 17 Defendants. 18 Plaintiff, an inmate currently incarcerated at the California Rehabilitation Center ("CRC") 19 in Norco, California and proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights Complaint pursuant to 42 20 U.S.C. § 1983. 21 22 I. Failure to Pay Filing Fee or Request IFP Status All parties instituting any civil action, suit or proceeding in any district court of the 23 United States, except an application for writ of habeas corpus, must pay a filing fee of \$350. See 24 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). An action may proceed despite a party's failure to pay this filing fee only 25 if the party is granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 26 § 1915(a). See Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047, 1051 (9th Cir. 2007); Rodriguez v. Cook, 27 169 F.3d 1176, 1177 (9th Cir. 1999). Here, Plaintiff has not prepaid the \$350 filing fee required 28

-1- 09cv0931

to commence a civil action, nor has he submitted a Motion to Proceed IFP. Therefore, the case must be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). *Id*.

## II. Conclusion and Order

For the reasons set forth above, the Court hereby:

- (1) **DISMISSES** this action sua sponte without prejudice for failing to pay the \$350 filing fee or file a Motion to Proceed IFP pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a) and 1915(a); and
- (2) **GRANTS** Plaintiff **forty five** (**45**) days leave from the date this Order is 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 period preceding the filing of his Complaint. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2); S.D. CAL. CIVLR 3.2(b).<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court shall provide Plaintiff with this 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 enclosed Motion to Proceed IFP within that time, this action shall remain dismissed without prejudice and without further Order of the Court.

**DATED:** May 7, 2009

IRMA E. GONZALEZ Chief Judge United States District Court

-2- 09cv0931

Plaintiff is cautioned that if he chooses to proceed further with this action either by paying the full 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. § 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 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)). Moreover, such a dismissal may be counted as a "strike" against Plaintiff if he requests IFP status in any future civil action filed while he is incarcerated. See Andrews, 493 F.3d at 1052 (under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, "[p]risoners who have repeatedly brought unsuccessful suits may entirely be barred from IFP status under the three strikes rule[.]"). Finally, to the extent Plaintiff's Complaint, which is almost wholly uncomprehensible, alleges civil rights violations occurring at CRC in Norco, it at the very least lacks proper venue. See 28 U.S.C. § 84(d); 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), 1406(a).