

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

8 MYRIAM ZAYAS,

9 Plaintiff,

Case No. C24-621 LK

10 v.

ORDER

11 ADRIENNE MCCOY, *et al.*,

12 Defendants.

13  
14 Plaintiff has filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) in the above-  
15 entitled action. (Dkt. # 1.) In the IFP application, Plaintiff states that she has not been employed  
16 since 2019 and cannot work due to her adult son’s disability. (*Id.* at 1.) Plaintiff reports that her  
17 only source of income in the past twelve months is \$17,500 from a settlement, that she has no  
18 money on hand, in checking, or in savings, and has \$850 in monthly expenses. (*Id.* at 1-2.)  
19 However, Plaintiff’s IFP application does not describe the types of each monthly expense (*e.g.*,  
20 housing, transportation, utilities, *etc.*) and does not explain how she pays any of her expenses.  
21 (*Id.* at 2.) Plaintiff further states that she is hesitant of publicly disclosing private information in  
22 her IFP application. (*Id.*)  
23

1 The district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed IFP upon completion of a  
2 proper affidavit of indigence. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). “To qualify for *in forma pauperis* status,  
3 a civil litigant must demonstrate both that the litigant is unable to pay court fees and that the  
4 claims he or she seeks to pursue are not frivolous.” *Ogunsalu v. Nair*, 117 F. App’x 522, 523  
5 (9th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 1051 (2005). To meet the first prong of this test, a litigant  
6 must show that he or she “cannot because of his [or her] poverty pay or give security for the  
7 costs and still be able to provide him[ or her]self and dependents with the necessities of life.”  
8 *Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948) (internal alterations  
9 omitted).

10 Plaintiff has not provided the Court with sufficient information to make an affirmative  
11 determination on her IFP application. Under these circumstances, Plaintiff should not be  
12 authorized to proceed IFP unless she addresses the deficiencies noted above. To the extent  
13 Plaintiff fears public disclosure of her private information, the Court directs Plaintiff to Local  
14 Court Rule (“LCR”) 5(g), which outlines the circumstances and procedures for filing documents  
15 under seal. *See* LCR 5(g) (available at <https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/local-rules-and-orders>  
16 (last accessed May 8, 2024)).

17 Accordingly, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause by **May 15, 2024**, why the Court  
18 should not recommend her IFP application be denied. The Clerk is directed to send copies of this  
19 Order to Plaintiff and to the Honorable Lauren King.

20 Dated this 8th day of May, 2024.

21 

22 MICHELLE L. PETERSON  
23 United States Magistrate Judge