

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------|
| ERIC ENGLISH, |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | 8:13CV308 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| GARY RANDALL, Judge of 4th |) | MEMORANDUM AND ORDER |
| Judicial District; SHERIFF |) | |
| OF DOUGLAS COUNTY; STATE OF |) | |
| NEBRASKA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondents. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

Petitioner has filed a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus under [28 U.S.C. § 2254](#) (Filing No. [1](#)) and a Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Filing No. [4](#)).

Habeas corpus cases attacking the legality of a person's confinement require the payment of a \$5.00 fee. [28 U.S.C. § 1914\(a\)](#). However, pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915\(a\)\(1\)-\(2\)](#), and after considering petitioner's financial status as shown in the records of this Court, provisional leave to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted, but petitioner must nevertheless pay the \$5.00 fee within 60 days. The Court cautions petitioner that failure to adequately comply with this order may result in dismissal of his petition without further notice.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The application to proceed in forma pauperis (Filing No. [4](#)) is provisionally granted, but petitioner must pay the \$5.00 filing fee by January 6, 2014.

2. The clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this case with the following text:
January 6, 2014: deadline for payment of \$5.00 filing fee.

DATED this 4th day of November, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Lyle E. Strom

LYLE E. STROM, Senior Judge
United States District Court

* This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the Court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The Court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the Court.