1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DI	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	IN RE DAVID FOLSOM,) Civil No. 10cv2440 L (NLS)
12	Debtor.) Bankruptcy No. 09-08919-B7
13) Adversary No. 10-90142-B7
14	DAVID FOLSOM; PAMELA BRODWOLF-FOLSOM,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA
15	Appellants,) PAUPERIS [doc. #19]
16	V.)
17	GERALD H. DAVIS, Chapter 7 Trustee,)
18	Appellee.)
19)
20	David Folsom moves to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. Under Rule 24(a)(1) of the	
21	Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, a "a party to a district-court action who desires to appeal in	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	(B) claims an entitlement to redress; and	
27	(C) states the issues that the party intends to present on appeal.	
28	FED. R. APP. PROC. 24(a)(1).	

10cv2440

Having reviewed the affidavit attached to Folsom's motion, the Court finds that he has failed
to demonstrate his inability to pay or to give security for fees and costs.

3 The benefit of proceeding IFP is a privilege, not a right. Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1231 (9th Cir. 1984). A petitioner need not "be absolutely destitute to enjoy the benefit of this 4 5 statute." Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948); Jefferson v. U.S., 277 6 F.2d 723, 725 (9th Cir. 1960), cert. denied, 364 U.S. 896 (1960). He must, however, demonstrate 7 his poverty with "some particularity, definiteness, and certainty." United States v. McQuade, 647 8 F.2d 938, 940 (9th Cir.1981) (per curiam). "[T]he same even-handed care must be employed to 9 assure that federal funds are not squandered to underwrite, at public expense, either frivolous claims 10 or the remonstrances of a suitor who is financially able, in whole or in material part, to pull his own 11 oar." Temple v. Ellerthorpe, 586 F. Supp. 848, 850 (D.R.I. 1984).

Folsom indicates that his average monthly amount of money received during the past 12 months and the amount expected next month is \$2,300.00. He also states that his total monthly expenses are \$985.00. Folsom's spouse anticipates receiving \$5,900.00 next month and having expenses of \$5,800.00. The affidavit also shows the value of real estate in the amounts of \$590,000 and \$350,000.00.

Under these facts, the Court is not persuaded that Folsom is unable to pay the appellate filing fee. Accordingly, Folsom's motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: August 22, 2011

ne Kamp M. Jamés

United States District Court Judge

24 COPY TO:

17

18

19

21

22

23

28

HON. NITA L. STORMES
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26

27 ALL COUNSEL/PARTIES