

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

ANDRA M. HAGINS,
Petitioner,

v.

JOHN GAY, WARDEN,
Respondent.

Case No. C06-5676FDB-KLS

REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION TO DENY
APPLICATION TO PROCEED
IN FORMA PAUPERIS

Noted for December 29, 2006

This case has been referred to Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Petitioner is an inmate at the Florence Correctional Center, located in Florence, Arizona. He filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. #2), but has paid the \$5.00 Court filing fee. Accordingly, the Court should deny the application.

DISCUSSION

A district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed *in forma pauperis* upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). However, the court has broad discretion in denying an application to proceed in forma pauperis. Weller v. Dickson, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963), *cert. denied*, 375 U.S. 845 (1963).

On November 20, 2006, the Clerk received petitioner’s petition (Dkt. #1) and his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Dkt. #2). On the same day, the Court’s records show petitioner paid the \$5.00 Court filing fee. Because he has paid the filing fee, petitioner’s application to proceed *in forma*

1 *pauperis* is therefore moot.

2 CONCLUSION

3 Because petitioner has paid the Court filing fee, the undersigned recommends that the Court deny
4 his application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

5 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“Fed. R.
6 Civ. P.”), petitioner shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report and Recommendation to file
7 written objections thereto. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of
8 those objections for purposes of appeal. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time
9 limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed set this matter for consideration on **December 29, 2005**,
10 as noted in the caption.

11 DATED this 5th day of December, 2006.

12

13

14



15

Karen L. Strombom
United States Magistrate Judge

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28