

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

\* \* \*

ARTURO TORRES OCHOA,

Case No. 3:13-cv-00245-MMD-VPC

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

RENEE BAKER, et al.,

Defendant.

This prisoner civil rights action comes before the Court following plaintiff's failure to pay the \$350.00 filing fee in response to the Court's order of June 19, 2013.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), "if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted," he may not proceed *in forma pauperis* and instead must pay the full \$350.00 filing fee in advance, unless he is under "imminent danger of serious physical injury." See *Andrews v. King*, 398 F.3d 1113, 1123 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005); see also *Rodriguez v. Cook*, 169 F.3d 1176, 1178-82 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999); *Tierney v. Kupers*, 128 F.3d 1310, 1311-12 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997).

In the order of June 19, 2013, the Court found that, on at least three (3) occasions, the Court has dismissed civil actions commenced by plaintiff while in

1 detention for failure to state a claim for which relief may be granted. (Dkt. no. 4.<sup>1</sup>) The  
2 Court denied plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and ordered he must  
3 pay the full filing fee within thirty (30) days or his case would be dismissed, pursuant to  
4 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). (*Id.*)

5 Plaintiff has not paid the filing fee. Plaintiff has, however, filed four notices of  
6 "updated motion." (Dkt. nos. 5, 6, 7, 8.) Only in his filing at dkt. no. 5 does plaintiff  
7 make an argument regarding imminent danger of physical injury. Plaintiff asserts that  
8 he was under imminent danger of physical injury because from August 7 through  
9 August 29, 2012, he was on a hunger strike. (Dkt. no. 5, at p. 1.) Plaintiff's allegation  
10 regarding a hunger strike almost one year ago does not establish that plaintiff is  
11 currently under imminent danger of serious physical injury. Plaintiff, having failed to pay  
12 the filing fee for this action and having failed to demonstrate that he is under imminent  
13 danger of serious physical injury, has not made the showing required by 28 U.S.C. §  
14 1915(g) to allow his complaint to proceed.

15 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without prejudice  
16 for failure to pay the filing fee. The Clerk of Court shall enter final judgment accordingly.

17 DATED THIS 24<sup>th</sup> day of July 2013.

18   
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 MIRANDA M. DU  
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

22  
23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>1</sup>See *Ochoa v. Cook, et al.*, 3:02-cv-00450-DWH-RAM; *Ochoa v. Willis, et al.*,  
27 3:02-cv-00545-ECR-VPC (both dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief  
28 may be granted); *Ochoa v. Putter C/O, et al.*, 3:10-cv-00364-HDM-RAM (dismissed as  
delusional and factually frivolous). The Court takes judicial notice of its prior records in  
the above matters.