

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 RONALD BUZZARD, JR. AND WILLIAM  
10 KEISLING,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 ISRB, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

Case No. C14-959-RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR WAIVER OF FEES

15  
16  
17 This matter comes before the Court on the “Motion for Waiver of Past Fees” filed by  
18 plaintiff Ronald Buzzard, Jr. Dkt. # 69. As pertains to the above-captioned matter,<sup>1</sup> Mr. Buzzard  
19 requests waiver of the amount he still owes on his filing fee: \$175.00. Dkt. # 69 at 1–2. On June  
20 9, 2014, Mr. Buzzard filed a “Declaration and Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*” and a  
21 form acknowledging responsibility for “payment of the full \$350.00 filing fee under 28 U.S.C.  
22 § 1915” and authorizing the agency having custody over him to collect this fee from his account  
23 in monthly payments. Dkt. # 1. The Court granted Mr. Buzzard IFP status on July 28, 2014. Dkt.  
24 # 8. Mr. Buzzard was a state prisoner at the time of that Order, and he remains a state prisoner  
25

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Judgment was issued in the above-captioned matter on July 22, 2015. Dkt. # 56. Mr. Buzzard’s  
28 civil rights complaint and action was dismissed with prejudice. Dkt. # 55. Mr. Buzzard also appears to  
be seeking waiver of fees related to other actions he initiated in this District, see Dkt. # 69 at 1–2 (citing  
case numbers), which the instant Order does not address.

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR WAIVER OF FEES - 1

1 today. Dkts. # 8, # 69. The 2014 Order granting Mr. Buzzard IFP status also directed the agency  
2 having custody over Mr. Buzzard to collect monthly payments from his account until the entire  
3 filing fee was paid. Dkt. # 8 at 2. Mr. Buzzard now requests that the Court waive the remainder  
4 of the unpaid filing fee due to his inability to pay. Dkt. # 69.

5 “28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) allows the district court to waive the [filing] fee, for most  
6 individuals unable to afford it, by granting IFP status.” Andrews v. Cervantes, 493 F.3d 1047,  
7 1051 (9th Cir. 2007). The Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), however, altered the IFP  
8 provisions for prisoners. Id. at 1052 (citing Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie, 239 F.3d 307, 312 (3d  
9 Cir. 2001) (en banc)). Although indigent prisoners are granted IFP status if they meet the  
10 prerequisites, “§1915(b) provides that prisoners proceeding IFP must pay the filing fee as funds  
11 become available in their prison accounts.” Id. Plaintiff is incarcerated and thus, under the  
12 PLRA, he must pay portions of the filing fee as funds become available in his prison account.  
13 Mr. Buzzard cites State v. Blazina, 182 Wn.2d 827 (2015), and State v. Ramirez, 191 Wn.2d  
14 732 (2018), for his position that his filing fee should be waived, but these cases are inapplicable  
15 because they pertain to legal financial obligations imposed by state courts in sentencing criminal  
16 defendants, not to filing fees required by plaintiffs pursuing civil actions in federal court.  
17 Therefore, Mr. Buzzard’s request to waive the filing fee is denied.

18 For all the foregoing reasons, Mr. Buzzard’s motion for waiver of fees (Dkt. # 69)  
19 is DENIED.

20 DATED this 3rd day of June, 2021.

21  
22  
23   
24 Robert S. Lasnik  
25 United States District Judge  
26  
27  
28