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

| ROBERT WILLIAM JOHNSON, |) | |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| VS. |) | No. 14-1271-JDT-egb |
| HAYWOOD COUNTY JAIL, |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

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

On October 9, 2014, Plaintiff Robert William Johnson, who was, at that time, incarcerated at the Haywood County Jail in Brownsville, Tennessee, filed a *pro se* complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF Nos. 1& 2.) In an order issued on October 14, 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.) Plaintiff subsequently notified the Court that he had been released and provided his new address. (ECF No. 5.)¹

On December 7, 2015, the Court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim but granted leave to file an amended complaint. (ECF No. 8.) Plaintiff was instructed that

¹ On October 5, 2015, the Court directed Plaintiff to either pay the entire filing fee or submit a non-prisoner *in forma pauperis* affidavit. (ECF No. 6.) Plaintiff complied with that order by submitting the appropriate affidavit on October 19, 2015. (ECF No. 7.)

any amended complaint must be filed within thirty days and that, should he fail to file an amended complaint within the time specified, the Court would assess a "strike" pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and enter judgment. (*Id.* at 9). However, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, and the time within which to do so has expired. Therefore, judgment will be entered in accordance with the December 7, 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

3