

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

9

10

11

PAMELA STICKLER,

CASE NO. 12-CV-68-LAB-BGS

12

vs.

Plaintiff,

**ORDER GRANTING LEAVE TO
PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*,
DENYING MOTION FOR
COUNSEL, AND DISMISSING
CASE**

13

14

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,

15

Defendant.

16

17

Ms. Stickler filed this case against the IRS in January of this year. Now pending are her Motion to Proceed IFP and Motion to Appoint Counsel.

18

19

I. IFP Motion

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

All parties instituting a civil action in a district court of the United States, except for habeas petitioners, must pay a filing fee of \$350. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). A party is excused from paying the fee, however, if the Court grants leave to proceed IFP pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1915(a). Ms. Stickler has submitted an IFP application that sufficiently demonstrates her inability to pay the \$350 filing fee. She was last employed in December of 2009, has no savings or other assets, and appears to rely on churches for assistance. Her Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* is therefore **GRANTED**.

27

///

28

///

1 **II. Initial Screening**

2 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the Court must screen each civil action commenced
3 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) and dismiss the action if the Court finds it is frivolous or
4 malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief
5 from an immune defendant. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *Calhoun v. Stahl*, 254 F.3d 845, 45
6 (9th Cir. 2001) (“[T]he provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) are not limited to prisoners.”);
7 *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1126-27 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc) (28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) “not
8 only permits but requires” the court to sua sponte dismiss an IFP complaint that fails to state
9 a claim).

10 The Court finds that Ms. Stickler’s complaint is frivolous and fails to state a claim upon
11 which relief can be granted. Ms. Stickler concedes she has been labeled a vexatious litigant,
12 and her complaint consists of two-handwritten pages in which, among other things, she
13 claims she has asked San Diego police to arrest IRS agents and “the President of U.S.A.
14 who may be part of it.” Ms. Stickler attaches to her complaint numerous pages from the
15 IRS’s website for which her complaint provides no context at all. Her case is **DISMISSED**
16 **WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**

17 **III. Motion to Appoint Counsel**


18 There is no absolute right to counsel in civil proceedings. *Hedges v. Resolution Trust*
19 *Corp.*, 32 F.3d 1360, 1363 (9th Cir. 1994). District courts do have discretion, pursuant to 28
20 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), to request that an attorney represent indigent civil litigants, but that
21 requires a substantial showing that Ms. Stickler does not make. Her motion is **DENIED.**

22

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 DATED: March 14, 2012

25



26

HONORABLE LARRY ALAN BURNS
United States District Judge

27

28