1		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8		,
9	NIKITA OZKAN,	CASE NO. C17-5144RBL
10	Plaintiff, v.	ORDER OF DISMISSAL
11	UNKNOWN DEFENDANTS,	
12	Defendant.	
13		
14	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff Ozkan's proposed amended complaint	
15	[Dkt. #3] in support of his application to proceed in forma pauperis [Dkt. #1].	
16	The Court ordered Ozkan to pay the filing fee or file an amended proposed amended	
17	complaint addressing a number of deficiencies in his first attempt. [Dkt. #2]. The Document he	
18	filed in response is no closer to articulating a plausible claim than was his first complaint.	
19	A district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed in forma pauperis upon	
20	completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). The court has broad	
21	discretion in resolving the application, but "the privilege of proceeding in forma pauperis in civil	
22	actions for damages should be sparingly granted." Weller v. Dickson, 314 F.2d 598, 600 (9th	
23	Cir. 1963), cert. denied 375 U.S. 845 (1963). Moreover, a court should "deny leave to proceed	
24		

in forma pauperis at the outset if it appears from the face of the proposed complaint that the action is frivolous or without merit." Tripati v. First Nat'l Bank & Trust, 821 F.2d 1368, 1369 (9th Cir. 1987) (citations omitted); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). An in forma pauperis complaint is frivolous if "it ha[s] no arguable substance in law or fact." Id. (citing Rizzo v. Dawson, 778 F.2d 527, 529 (9th Cir. 1985); Franklin v. Murphy, 745 F.2d 1221, 1228 (9th Cir.

Ozkan's proposed amended complaint does not meet this standard. It remains a disorganized collection or words, and it has not identified any single act or defendant or claim. It has no ascertainable "facts;" it does not make sense: