1		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8	ROCKY MEL CONTRERAS,	CASE NO. C12-5971RBL
9	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
10	v.	LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS [DKT. 1] AND
11	WES WESLEY, et al,	DENYING MOTION FOR DISCOVERY AND INSPECTION
12	Defendant.	[DKT. 3]
13		
14	THIS MATTER is before the Court on two motions by Plaintiff, Rocky Mel Contreras.	
15	The Court has reviewed the Complaint and the mistitled Motion for Discovery and Inspection.	
16	In the Motion for Discovery and Inspection, the plaintiff does nothing more than to supply	
17	information about his indigency. It is not a discovery request to any party.	
18	A district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed in forma pauperis upon	
19	completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). The court has broad	
20	discretion in resolving the application, but "the privilege of proceeding in forma pauperis in civil	
21	actions for damages should be sparingly granted." Weller v. Dickson, 314 F.2d 598, 600 (9th	
22	Cir. 1963), cert. denied 375 U.S. 845 (1963). Moreover, a court should "deny leave to proceed	
23	in forma pauperis at the outset if it appears from the face of the proposed complaint that the	
24	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO	

PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS [DKT. 1] AND DENYING MOTION FOR DISCOVERY AND

INSPECTION [DKT. 3] - 1

1	action is frivolous or without merit." Tripati v. First Nat'l Bank & Trust, 821 F.2d 1368, 1369
2	(9th Cir. 1987) (citations omitted); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). An in forma pauperis
3	complaint is frivolous if "it ha[s] no arguable substance in law or fact." <i>Id.</i> (citing <i>Rizzo v</i> .
4	Dawson, 778 F.2d 527, 529 (9th Cir. 1985); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1228 (9th Cir.
5	1984).
6	A review of the Complaint convinces the Court that the Complaint is frivolous and it has
7	no arguable substance in law or fact. For that reason, the Motion for Leave to Proceed <i>In Forma</i>
8	Pauperis [Dkt. #1] is DENIED. The Motion for Discovery and Inspection [Dkt. #3] is DENIED
9	AS MOOT.
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	Dated this 12th day of December, 2012.
12	Konal B. Leightun
13	Ronald B. Leighton United States District Judge
14	Omica states District vadge
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
、	