

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
EASTERN DIVISION

MIKE DEWYANE EDWARDS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
VS.)	No. 14-1203-JDT-egb
)	
MONTE BELEW, ET AL.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER DIRECTING ENTRY OF JUDGMENT,
CERTIFYING AN APPEAL WOULD NOT BE TAKEN IN GOOD FAITH AND
DENYING LEAVE TO APPEAL *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

On August 20, 2014, Plaintiff Mike Dewyane Edwards, who was, at the time, incarcerated at the Northeast Correctional Complex in Mountain City, Tennessee, filed a *pro se* complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, accompanied by a motion seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF Nos. 1& 2.) In an order issued on August 21, 2014, the Court granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and assessed the civil filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(a)-(b). (ECF No. 4.) The order also instructed Plaintiff to notify the Court of any change of address and warned that failure to do so could result in dismissal of the action without further notice. (*Id.* at 3.)

On December 14, 2015, the Court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim but granted leave to file an amended complaint. (ECF No. 7.) Plaintiff was instructed that any amended complaint must be filed within thirty days and that, should he fail to file an

amendment within the time specified, the Court would assess a “strike” pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and enter judgment. (*Id.* at 12). However, on December 28, 2015, Plaintiff’s copy of that order was returned by the postal service as undeliverable, marked “paroled.” (ECF No. 8.)

The most basic responsibility of a litigant is to keep the Court informed of his whereabouts. Despite his release, Plaintiff has submitted no change of address and has not communicated with the Court in any other way. Therefore, judgment will be entered in accordance with the December 14, 2015, order of dismissal.

The Court must also consider whether Plaintiff should be allowed to appeal this decision *in forma pauperis*, should he seek to do so. A non-prisoner desiring to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* must obtain pauper status under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a). *See Callihan v. Schneider*, 178 F.3d 800, 803-04 (6th Cir. 1999). However, Rule 24(a)(3) provides that if a party was permitted to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the district court, he may also proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* without further authorization unless the district court “certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith or finds that the party is not otherwise entitled to proceed in forma pauperis.” If the district court denies pauper status, the party may file a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the Court of Appeals. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(4)-(5).

The good faith standard is an objective one. *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). The test for whether an appeal is taken in good faith is whether the litigant seeks appellate review of any issue that is not frivolous. *Id.* It would be inconsistent for a district

court to determine that a complaint should be dismissed prior to service on the defendants, but has sufficient merit to support an appeal *in forma pauperis*. See *Williams v. Kullman*, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983). The same considerations that lead the Court to dismiss this case for failure to state a claim also compel the conclusion that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

It is CERTIFIED, pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a), that any appeal in this matter by Plaintiff would not be taken in good faith. Leave to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* is, therefore, DENIED. Accordingly, if Plaintiff files a notice of appeal, he must also pay the full \$505 appellate filing fee or file a motion for leave to appeal *in forma pauperis* and supporting affidavit in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.

For analysis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) of future filings, if any, by Plaintiff, this is the first dismissal of one of his cases as frivolous or for failure to state a claim. This “strike” shall take effect when judgment is entered. *Coleman v. Tollefson*, 135 S. Ct. 1759, 1763-64 (2015).

The Clerk is directed to prepare a judgment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ James D. Todd

JAMES D. TODD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE