Gwin v. Collins-Williams et al Doc. 5

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

| ROBERT IRWIN GWIN,                | )                     |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Plaintiff,                        | )<br>)                |
| VS.                               | ) No. 17-2054-JDT-cgc |
| TAMIEKA COLLINS-WILLIAMS, ET AL., | )<br>)                |
| Defendants.                       | )                     |

## ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO COMPLY WITH 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2) OR PAY THE \$400 CIVIL FILING FEE

On January 20, 2017, Plaintiff Robert Irwin Gwin, Tennessee Department of Correction prisoner number 72375, who is incarcerated at the Bledsoe County Correctional Complex ("BCCX") in Pikeville, Tennessee, filed a *pro se* complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, accompanied by a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF Nos. 1 & 2.)

Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA"), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(a)-(b), a prisoner bringing a civil action must pay the filing fee required by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). Although the obligation to pay the fee accrues at the moment the case is filed, *see McGore v. Wriggleworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 605 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997), *partially overruled on other grounds by LaFountain v. Harry*, 716 F.3d. 944, 951 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2013), the PLRA provides the prisoner the opportunity to make a "down payment" of a partial filing fee and pay the

remainder in installments. § 1915(b)(2). However, in order to take advantage of the installment procedures, the prisoner must properly complete and submit to the district court, along with the complaint, an *in forma pauperis* affidavit containing a current certification by the prison trust account officer and a copy of his trust account statement for the last six months immediately preceding the filing of the complaint. § 1915(a)(2).

In this case, the affidavit submitted by Plaintiff is not accompanied by a current certified copy of his trust account statement. Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to submit, within thirty 30 days after the date of this order, either the entire \$400 civil filing fee<sup>1</sup> or a current copy of his trust account statement for the last six months.<sup>2</sup> If Plaintiff needs additional time to file the required document, he may request one 30-day extension of time from this Court. *McGore*, 114 F.3d at 605.

If Plaintiff timely submits the necessary document and the Court finds that he is indeed indigent, the Court will grant leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and assess a filing fee of only \$350 in accordance with the installment procedures of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b). However, if the Plaintiff fails to comply with this order in a timely manner, the Court will

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Twenty-eight U.S.C. § 1914(a) requires a civil filing fee of \$350. In addition, § 1914(b) requires the clerk to "collect from the parties such additional fees…as are prescribed by the Judicial Conference of the United States." The Judicial Conference has prescribed an additional administrative fee of \$50 for filing any civil case, except for cases seeking habeas corpus and cases in which the plaintiff is granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* umder 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Therefore, if Plaintiff is ultimately granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in accordance with the PLRA, he will not be responsible for the additional \$50 fee.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Plaintiff does not need to submit another *in forma pauperis* affidavit.

deny leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, assess the entire \$400 filing fee without regard to the installment payment procedures, and dismiss the action without further notice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), for failure to prosecute. *McGore*, 114 F.3d at 605.<sup>3</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

<u>s/James D. Todd</u> JAMES D. TODD UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Even a voluntary dismissal by Plaintiff will not eliminate the obligation to pay the filing fee. *McGore*, 114 F.3d at 607; *see also In re Alea*, 286 F.3d 378, 381 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002).