

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Kaleb Lee Basey v. Jolene Goeden, et al.

Basey · No. 1:26-cv-00001-SLG · Decided May 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Alaska granted Defendants’ motion to screen the prisoner-plaintiff’s complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court held that screening was required because Plaintiff remained incarcerated, directed Defendants not to answer unless ordered, and reminded Plaintiff to comply with applicable federal and local rules.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Alaska
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sharon L. Gleason
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Alaska
DECIDED	May 13, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-00001-SLG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to require screening of Plaintiff's prisoner complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court granted the motion and deferred screening of the complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Kaleb Lee Basey v. Jolene Goeden, et al.

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil procedure
- pleadings
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a federal district court must screen a prisoner's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A when the prisoner has paid the filing fee in full.

2. Whether Defendants' motion for screening should be granted based on Plaintiff's status as a prisoner seeking relief against the government.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court must screen a complaint brought by a prisoner seeking relief against a governmental entity, officer, or employee even when the prisoner has paid the filing fee in full.
2. Defendants' motion for screening at Docket 10 is granted, and Defendants need not answer or otherwise respond to the complaint unless and until ordered by the court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, a federal district court must screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity, even when the prisoner has paid the filing fee in full.”

“For these reasons, Defendants’ motion for screening at Docket 10 is GRANTED.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Kaleb Basey filed the action while incarcerated but provided a residential address and paid the filing fee, causing the court initially to issue an order intended for non-prisoner litigants. Defendants later advised that Basey was a prisoner seeking relief against the government. The court independently confirmed that Basey remained imprisoned at FMC Lexington in Federal Bureau of Prisons custody.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on January 12, 2026, paid the filing fee, and provided an address that led the court initially to treat him as a non-prisoner litigant. Defendants later informed the court that Plaintiff was imprisoned and sought screening under the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Plaintiff did not oppose the motion, and the court granted it.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Belanus v. Clark*, 796 F.3d 1021, 1029 (9th Cir. 2015)

OPINION

Basey

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

KALEB LEE BASEY,

Plaintiff, v. Case No. 1:26-cv-00001-SLG JOLENE GOEDEN, et al., Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SCREENING

On January 12, 2026, self-represented litigant Kaleb Basey ("Plaintiff") filed this case, paid the filing fee, and provided what appears to be a residential address on his Complaint.¹ Incorrectly inferring from that address that Plaintiff had been released from prison, the Court issued a Standing Order intended for non-prisoner litigants who have paid the Court's filing fee.² However, on April 27, 2026, Defendants filed a motion for screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and indicated that Plaintiff is a prisoner seeking redress against the government.³ Plaintiff has not responded, and his deadline to do so has passed.⁴ Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, a federal district court must screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or

¹ Docket 1.

² Docket 4.

³ Docket 10.

⁴ Alaska Local Civil Rule 7.2(b)(1) (providing that oppositions to non-dispositive motions must be filed within 14 days of service). officer or employee of a governmental entity, even when the prisoner has paid the filing fee in full.⁵ The Ninth Circuit has emphasized that frivolous actions drain resources regardless of whether the plaintiff pays the filing fee, justifying the application of deterrent measures even to prisoners who can afford full payment.⁶ Plaintiff's notice of change of address indicates that he recently provided another individual's mailing address,⁷ and the Court has independently confirmed that Plaintiff remains imprisoned at FMC Lexington in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons ("BOP").⁸ For these reasons, Defendants' motion for screening at Docket 10 is GRANTED. The Court will screen Plaintiff's Complaint in due course. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. Defendants' motion for screening at Docket 10 is GRANTED.

2. Defendants need not file an Answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint unless and until so ordered.

3. Self-represented litigants must review and comply with the Federal

5 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A. 6 *Belanus v. Clark*, 796 F.3d 1021, 1029 (9th Cir. 2015) ("We see no reason for allowing wealthy prisoners to clog the courts by paying the filing fees, when access would be denied to an impecunious prisoner, particularly as filing fees do not come close to covering the cost to the court of a frivolous action.").

⁷ Docket 8.

⁸ Information regarding prisoners in federal custody, such as current location and tentative release date, is available through the BOP's online inmate locator at <https://www.bop.gov/inmateloc/>. Rules of Civil Procedure, the District of Alaska's Local Civil Rules, and all Court orders.⁹ Failure to do so may result in the imposition of sanctions authorized by law, including dismissal of the action. DATED this 13th day of May, 2026, at Anchorage, Alaska. /s/ Sharon L. Gleason

SHARON L. GLEASON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

9 See 28 U.S.C. § 1654 (permitting parties in federal court to represent themselves or be represented by an attorney, subject to the court’s rules); Local Civil Rule 1.1(a)(3) (“All parties, including self-represented parties, must comply with these Local Rules and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. References in these rules to “counsel” or “attorneys” also refer to self-represented parties.”). See also U.S. Courts, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, <https://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/current-rules-practice-procedure/federal-rules-civil-procedure>; U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska, Local Rules and Orders, <https://www.akd.uscourts.gov/court-info/local-rules-and-orders/local-rules>.