

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,  
CDCR #J-48500,  
  
Plaintiff,

vs.

JUDGES AMALIA L. MEZA,  
CHARLES G. ROGERS, ESTEBAN  
HERNANDEZ, LAURA H. PARSKY,  
ROBERT F. O’NEIL, JOSEPH P.  
BRANNIGAN, MICHAEL R. SMYTH,  
PETER LURGEH, DANIEL F. LINK,  
DAVID M. GILL, LAURA J.  
BIRKMEYER, RONDA TRAPP and  
KATHERINE A. BACALL, and JOHN  
DOE 1-1000 Court Clerks,  
  
Defendants.

Case No.: 24cv2504-JAH (DEB)

**ORDER DISMISSING CIVIL  
ACTION FOR FAILURE TO PAY  
FILING FEE REQUIRED BY  
28 U.S.C. § 1914(a)**

Plaintiff Steven Wayne Bonilla (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se and currently incarcerated at California Medical Facility, has filed a civil rights Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See ECF No. 1. Plaintiff has not filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) in this matter, nor has he paid the initial civil filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). For the reasons explained below, the Court **DISMISSES** the case.

1 **I. FAILURE TO PAY FILING FEE OR REQUEST IFP STATUS**

2 All parties instituting any civil action, suit or proceeding in a district court of the  
3 United States, except an application for writ of habeas corpus, must pay a filing fee of  
4 \$405, consisting of a \$350 statutory fee plus an additional administrative fee of \$55,  
5 although the administrative fee does not apply to persons granted leave to proceed IFP.  
6 See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) (Judicial Conference Schedule of Fees, District Court Misc. Fee  
7 Schedule, § 14 (eff. Dec. 1, 2023)). The action may proceed despite a plaintiff’s failure to  
8 prepay the entire fee only if he is granted leave to proceed IFP pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
9 § 1915(a). See *Andrews v. Cervantes*, 493 F.3d 1047, 1051 (9th Cir. 2007); cf. *Hymas v.*  
10 *U.S. Dep’t of the Interior*, 73 F.4th 763, 765 (9th Cir. 2023) (“[W]here [an] IFP application  
11 is denied altogether, Plaintiff’s case [cannot] proceed unless and until the fee[s] [a]re  
12 paid.”)

13 The Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”) also requires prisoners to submit a  
14 certified copy of their trust fund account statement, or an institutional equivalent) for the  
15 6-month period immediately preceding the filing of the complaint. See 28 U.S.C.  
16 § 1915(a)(2); *Andrews v. King*, 398 F.3d 1113, 1119 (9th Cir. 2005). “While the previous  
17 version of the IFP statute granted courts the authority to waive fees for any person ‘unable  
18 to pay[,]’ . . . the PLRA amended the IFP statute to include a carve-out for prisoners: under  
19 the current version of the IFP statute, ‘if a prisoner brings a civil action or files an appeal  
20 in forma pauperis, the prisoner shall be required to pay the full amount of a filing fee.’”  
21 *Hymas*, 73 F.4th at 767 (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)). Section 1915(b) “provides a  
22 structured timeline for collecting this fee.” *Id.*(citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)-(2)).

23 Plaintiff has not paid the \$405 filing and administrative fee required. He has also  
24 failed to file a properly supported motion to proceed IFP. See *Escobedo*, 787 F.3d at 1234.  
25 Therefore, his case cannot continue. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a); *Andrews*, 493 F.3d at 1051.

26 **II. LEAVE TO PROCEED IFP**

27 Even if the Court granted Plaintiff leave to file a motion to proceed IFP, however, it  
28 finds he is not entitled to that privilege for the reasons set out below.

1           **A.     Standard of Review**

2           “All persons, not just prisoners, may seek IFP status.” *Moore v. Maricopa Cnty.*  
3 *Sheriff’s Office*, 657 F.3d 890, 892 (9th Cir. 2011). Prisoners, like Plaintiff, however, “face  
4 an additional hurdle.” *Id.* In addition to requiring prisoners to “pay the full amount of a  
5 filing fee” in installments for the suits or appeals they launch, *see Bruce v. Samuels*, 577  
6 U.S. 82, 85 (2016) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)–(2), *Williams v. Paramo*, 775 F.3d 1182,  
7 1185 (9th Cir. 2015), the PLRA also amended Section 1915 to preclude the privilege to  
8 proceed IFP:

9           . . . if [a] prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or  
10 detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United  
11 States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails  
12 to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, unless the prisoner is under  
imminent danger of serious physical injury.

13 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). This subdivision is commonly known as the “PLRA’s ‘three strikes’  
14 rule.” *Washington v. Los Angeles Cnty. Sheriff’s Dep’t*, 833 F.3d 1048, 1054 (9th Cir.  
15 2016). “Pursuant to § 1915(g), a prisoner with three strikes or more cannot proceed IFP.”  
16 *Andrews*, 398 F.3d at 1116 n.1. The PLRA furthers “the congressional goal of reducing  
17 frivolous prisoner litigation in federal court.” *Tierney v. Kupers*, 128 F.3d 1310, 1312 (9th  
18 Cir. 1997).

19           “Strikes are prior cases or appeals, brought while the plaintiff was a prisoner, which  
20 were dismissed on the ground that they were frivolous, malicious, or failed to state a claim,”  
21 *Andrews*, 398 F.3d at 1116 n.1 (internal quotations omitted), “even if the district court  
22 styles such dismissal as a denial of the prisoner’s application to file the action without  
23 prepayment of the full filing fee.” *O’Neal v. Price*, 531 F.3d 1146, 1153 (9th Cir. 2008).  
24 When courts “review a dismissal to determine whether it counts as a strike, the style of the  
25 dismissal or the procedural posture is immaterial. Instead, the central question is whether  
26 the dismissal ‘rang the PLRA bells of frivolous, malicious, or failure to state a claim.’” *El-*  
27 *Shaddai v. Zamora*, 833 F.3d 1036, 1042 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Blakely v. Wards*, 738  
28 F.3d 607, 615 (4th Cir. 2013)).

1           Once a prisoner has accumulated three strikes, he is prohibited by Section 1915(g)  
2 from pursuing any other IFP action in federal court unless he can show he is facing  
3 “imminent danger of serious physical injury.” *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); *Cervantes*, 493  
4 F.3d at 1051-52 (noting Section 1915(g)’s exception for IFP complaints which “make[] a  
5 plausible allegation that the prisoner faced ‘imminent danger of serious physical injury’ at  
6 the time of filing.”) In addition to being “imminent,” that danger must also be “both fairly  
7 traceable to unlawful conduct alleged in [the] complaint and redressable by the court.” *Ray*  
8 *v. Lara*, 31 F.4th 692, 701 (9th Cir. 2022).

### 9           **B. Discussion**

10           The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s Complaint and finds it fails to contain any  
11 “plausible allegations” to suggest that he “faced ‘imminent danger of serious physical  
12 injury’ at the time of filing.” *Cervantes*, 493 F.3d at 1055 (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g)).  
13 Rather, Plaintiff alleges there was no federal grand jury subpoena for the evidence  
14 presented in his state criminal trial in the Alameda County Superior Court and that he is  
15 the victim of a conspiratorial and discriminatory criminal prosecution. *See* ECF No. 1 at  
16 2-3. He seeks to sue judges and clerks for subsequently refusing to “void” that conviction.  
17 *Id.* at 1-3.

18           Thus, while Plaintiff has not moved to proceed IFP in this case; it would be futile  
19 for him to do so. Defendants typically carry the initial burden to produce evidence  
20 demonstrating a prisoner is not entitled to proceed IFP. *Andrews*, 398 F.3d at 1119.  
21 However, “in some instances, the district court docket may be sufficient to show that []  
22 prior dismissal[s] satisfy[y] at least one on the criteria under § 1915(g)” and therefore count  
23 as strikes against him. *Id.* at 1120. That is true here. Based on the dockets of many court  
24 proceedings available on PACER,<sup>1</sup> this Court finds that Plaintiff Steven Wayne Bonilla,  
25

---

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> *See Kim v. Allison*, 87 F.4th 994, 998 n.3 (9th Cir. 2023) (citing *United States ex rel.*  
28 *Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc.*, 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992)  
(noting courts “may take notice of proceedings in other courts, both within and without the

1 identified as CDCR #J-48500, while incarcerated, has had dozens of prisoner civil actions  
2 or appeals dismissed on the grounds that they were frivolous, malicious, or failed to state  
3 a claim upon which relief may be granted. *See In re Steven Bonilla*, 2012 WL 216401, at  
4 \*1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 24, 2012) (noting Plaintiff’s litigation history in the Northern District of  
5 California, including the dismissal of 34 pro se civil rights actions between June 1 and  
6 October 31, 2011, alone, which were dismissed “because the allegations in [his] complaints  
7 d[id] not state a claim for relief under § 1983.”); *id.* at \*3 (“The following five actions are  
8 DISMISSED without prejudice and without leave to amend for failure to state a claim upon  
9 which relief may be granted: *Bonilla v. Superior Court of Alameda County*, C 11-6306;  
10 *Bonilla v. Alameda County District Attorney’s Office*, C 11-6307; *Bonilla v. California*  
11 *Supreme Court*, C 12-0026; *Bonilla v. Cullen*, C 12-0027; *Bonilla v. California Supreme*  
12 *Court*, C 12-0206.”); *id.* at \*3 n.1 (“The Court recently informed Plaintiff that, in  
13 accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), he no longer qualifies to proceed in forma pauperis  
14 in any civil rights action.”) (citing *In re Steven Bonilla*, Nos. C11-3180, *et seq.* CW (PR),  
15 Order of Dismissal at 6:23-7:19)).

16       Accordingly, because Plaintiff has, while incarcerated, accumulated far more than  
17 the three strikes permitted by Section 1915(g), and he fails to make any plausible allegation  
18 that he faced imminent danger of serious physical injury at the time he filed this case, he  
19 is not entitled to the privilege of proceeding IFP. *See Cervantes*, 493 F.3d at 1055;  
20 *Rodriguez v. Cook*, 169 F.3d 1176, 1180 (9th Cir. 1999) (noting that 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g)  
21 “does not prevent all prisoners from accessing the courts; it only precludes prisoners with  
22 a history of abusing the legal system from continuing to abuse it while enjoying IFP  
23 status”). When a prisoner-litigant “has accumulated three prior dismissals on statutorily  
24 enumerated grounds[,] . . . a court may not afford him *in forma pauperis status* with respect  
25

---

26  
27 federal judicial system, if those proceedings have a direct relation to matters at issue”); *Lee*  
28 *v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 689 (9th Cir. 2001) (noting that courts may take  
judicial notice of undisputed “matters of public record”).

1 to his additional civil actions.” *Coleman v. Tollefson*, 575 U.S. 532, 534 (2015). This is  
2 because “court permission to proceed IFP is itself a matter of privilege and not right.”  
3 *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1231 (9th Cir. 1984).

4 **III. CONCLUSION**


5 Accordingly, the Court:

6 (1) **DISMISSES** this case based on Plaintiff’s failure to pay the civil filing fee  
7 required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a); and

8 (2) **DIRECTS** the Clerk of the Court to enter a final judgment of dismissal, close  
9 the file, and accept no further documents for filing in this matter except a timely Notice of  
10 Appeal, which the Court **CERTIFIES** would not be taken in good faith pursuant to 28  
11 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: January 27, 2025

14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 Hon. John A. Houston  
17 United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28