

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ROBERT D. BETTEN, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff(s), )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting Commissioner )  
 of Social Security Administration, )  
 )  
 Defendant(s). )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. 2:18-cv-00536-KJD-NJK  
**ORDER**  
(Docket No. 1)

Plaintiff has requested authority pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Docket No. 1. In determining whether to permit a plaintiff to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court evaluates the income and assets to which the plaintiff has access, including those of his spouse. *See, e.g., Flores v. Colvin*, 2014 U.S. Dist. Lexis 93236, at \*3-4 (D. Nev. May 22, 2014) (collecting cases). “If the plaintiff is supported by [his] spouse, and [his] spouse is financially able to pay the costs of this appeal, it follows that the plaintiff’s own lack of funds will not prevent [him] from gaining access to the courts.” *Monti v. McKeon*, 600 F. Supp. 112, 114 (D. Conn. 1984). The pending application makes clear that Plaintiff’s spouse is employed, but has failed to identify what her income is. Docket No. 1 at 1.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* is **DENIED** without prejudice.

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> The application confusingly states that “[a]ll finances in this application are joint,” but identifies no incoming pay despite representing that Plaintiff’s wife is employed. *See id.*

1 Any renewed application to proceed *in forma pauperis* must be made on **the long form** (AO 239)  
2 to ensure that both Plaintiff's and his spouse's income, assets, and liabilities are properly considered. Any  
3 such application shall be filed by April 16, 2018. Alternatively, Plaintiff may pay the filing fee by April  
4 16, 2018.<sup>2</sup>

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: April 3, 2018

7  
8   
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 NANCY J. KOPPE  
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>2</sup> Consistent with Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff's counsel shall carefully  
26 consider whether a reasonable basis exists for seeking *in forma pauperis* status before filing any renewed  
27 application. In particular, while the Court does not herein reach a final conclusion since the current  
28 application is incomplete, the tens of thousands of dollars of cash available to Plaintiff appears likely an  
insurmountable hurdle for any renewed application even without considering Plaintiff's spouse's income.  
*See* Docket No. 1 at 2.