Turay v. Strong et al Doc. 10

1		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COLIRT
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8	RICHARD G TURAY,	CASE NO. C14-5448 RBL
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
11	V.	[DKT. #9]
12	MARK STRONG,	
13	Defendant.	
14	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff Turay's Motion for Reconsideration of	
15	the Court's denial of his application to proceed in forma pauperis [Dkt. #8] The Magistrate	
16	Judge's Report and Recommendation accurately and clearly explained the deficiencies in	
17	Turay's IFP application:	
18	The Court will not grant in forma pauperis without full disclosure of a person's ability to pay.	
19		uts to proceed in forms pouncie upon
20	court has broad discretion in denying an application to proceed in forma pauperis. <i>Weller v. Dickson</i> , 314 F.2d 598, 600 (9th Cir. 1963), <i>cert. denied</i> , 375 U.S. 845 (1963). Plaintiff has not filed a proper affidavit of indigence. Plaintiff did not	
21		
22		
23	information the Court required. The undersig	gned recommends demai or plantin s
24		

application to proceed in forma pauperis. Plaintiff should be given thirty days to pay the full filing fee of four hundred dollars. [Dkt. #6 at 2] Turay's current Motion reiterates his claim that he cannot afford the filing fee, but it does not address, much less remedy, the deficiencies outlined above. The Motion for Reconsideration [Dkt. #9] is therefore DENIED, and if the Plaintiff does not pay the filing fee by Friday, September 12, 23014, the case will be dismissed without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 29th day of August, 2014. RONALD B. LEIGHTON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE