


1 Lee's signature is on the form. *Id.* It is unclear whether the financial information listed belongs to one
2 or both plaintiffs. *Id.* Additionally, the application states that plaintiffs are incarcerated, even though
3 only plaintiff Hernandez is actually incarcerated. *Id.* Accordingly, plaintiffs' request to proceed *in*
4 *forma pauperis* is denied without prejudice pursuant to § 1915(a). Plaintiffs will each need to fill out
5 and sign their own individual applications and may re-submit to the court, at which time the court will
6 then screen the complaint pursuant to § 1915(e).¹

7 Accordingly, and for good cause shown,

8 IT IS ORDERED that plaintiffs Nora Hernandez and Robin M. Lee's Application to Proceed
9 *In Forma Pauperis* (#1) is DENIED *without prejudice*.

10 DATED this 21st day of November, 2012.

11 

12 _____
13 **CAM FERENBACH**
14 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 ¹ Dismissal of a *pro se* complaint is appropriate if it is "so confused, ambiguous, vague or otherwise
26 unintelligible that its true substance, if any, is disguised." *Gillibeau v. City of Richmond*, 417 F.2d 426, 431 (9th
Cir.1969). Plaintiffs may wish to redraft the complaint so it is in a comprehensible, legible form.