

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
COLUMBUS DIVISION**

LORETTA WRIGHT,

Plaintiff,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., *et al.* ,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO. 4:14-CV-2 (CDL)

ORDER

On May 19, 2014, the Court issued an Order granting Defendants’ motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s *pro se* “Declaration of Insolvency.” (ECF No. 24.) Specifically, the Court found that Plaintiff’s Complaint and Amended Complaint are frivolous and fail to state a claim. (Order 4, May 19, 2014, ECF No. 24.) Judgment for the Defendants was entered the same day. (ECF No. 25.) Plaintiff thereafter moved for an extension of time to file a motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 26), which the Court denied. There again the Court explained that Plaintiff’s claims are frivolous and “[a]ny motion for reconsideration would be futile.” (Text-only Order, June 10, 2014.)

Plaintiff has now filed a Notice of Appeal and a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal from this Court’s judgment dismissing her Complaint. (ECF Nos. 27, 28.) An appeal cannot be taken in good faith in this case because, as has been previously explained to Plaintiff, her claims are frivolous. Likewise, her appeal is frivolous. Plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal is accordingly **DENIED**. *See*

28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) (“An appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith.”); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3) (“A party who was permitted to proceed in forma pauperis in the district-court action . . . may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis . . . unless . . . the district court . . . certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith or finds that the party is not otherwise entitled to proceed in forma pauperis[.]”).

If Plaintiff wishes to proceed with his appeal, she must pay the entire \$505.00 appellate filing fee. Any further requests to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal should be directed, on motion, to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, in accordance with Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

SO ORDERED, this 28th day of July, 2014.

S/Stephen Hyles

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE