



cases, in which he was allowed to proceed in forma pauperis, that were dismissed as frivolous. See Davis v. U.S.A., No. CIV-89-2218-T, 1991 WL 35272, at \*1 (10th Cir. Feb. 20, 1991) (appeal dismissed as frivolous and not taken in good faith); Davis v. Beach, et al., 5:91-cv-13-SBH-HWM (E.D. Tx. 1991) (complaint dismissed as frivolous and affirmed on appeal); Davis v. Reno, 1:94-cv-694-RCF (N.D. Ga. 1994) (complaint dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)); Davis v. Reno, 1:95-cv-1648-UNA (D.D.C. 1995) (complaint dismissed sua sponte pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) and affirmed on appeal). As Plaintiff has accumulated at least three strikes and makes no allegations sufficient to invoke the imminent danger exception, Plaintiff is not entitled to in forma pauperis status on appeal. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Permission to Appeal In Forma Pauperis (Doc. 12) is denied.

**SO ORDERED**, this the 12th day of December, 2006.

/s/ Hugh Lawson

**HUGH LAWSON, Judge**