

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TINA CHERISE WALTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

HIGH PRIORITY LOANS, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-12085

SENIOR U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
ARTHUR J. TARNOW

U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE
STEPHANIE DAWKINS DAVIS

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS [2] AND GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST FOR SERVICE BY U.S. MARSHAL [3]

On June 8, 2016, Plaintiff filed a pro se Complaint [Dkt. #1], an Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis [2], and a Request for Service by U.S. Marshal [3]. The court may authorize the commencement of a suit “without prepayment of fees or security therefor, by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets . . . [indicating] that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1); *see also McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 608 (6th Cir. 1997) (overruled on other grounds by *LaFountain v. Harry*, 716 F.3d 944, 951 (6th Cir. 2013)).

Here, Plaintiff has submitted an affidavit stating that she has been on medical leave with no pay since May 16, 2016.¹ She receives no other income and has no assets. The Court will therefore grant Plaintiff's Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis [2]. It is also appropriate to grant Plaintiff's Request for Service by U.S. Marshal [3]. *Reed-Bey v. Pramstaller*, 607 F. App'x 445, 450 (6th Cir. 2015) ("When a plaintiff is proceeding in forma pauperis, the district court bears the responsibility for issuing the plaintiff's process to a United States Marshal, who must effect service upon the defendants once the plaintiff has properly identified them.") (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d); FED. R. CIV. P. 4(c)(3); *Byrd v. Stone*, 94 F.3d 217, 219 (6th Cir. 1996)). Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis [2] is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Request for Service by U.S. Marshal [3] is **GRANTED**.

SO ORDERED.

s/Arthur J. Tarnow

Arthur J. Tarnow

Senior United States District Judge

Dated: September 16, 2016

¹ While working, Plaintiff's gross pay was \$560.00 per week.