

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

**Justin v. SF State University**

Justin · No. 25-cv-03492-TSH · Decided May 19, 2025

---

OPINION

Justin v. SF State University

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 MALIK M. JUSTIN, Case No. 25-cv-03492-TSH 8 Plaintiff,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

9 v.

10 SF STATE UNIVERSITY,

11 Defendant. 12

13 Plaintiff Malik M. Justin initiated this lawsuit by filing a complaint (ECF No. 1) and 14  
application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2). Based on the information provided in his  
15 application, the Court was unable to determine whether Plaintiff is entitled to proceed in forma  
16 pauperis. For instance, while Plaintiff states he is not presently employed, for past  
employment, 17 he wrote in a number then crossed it out and wrote in his initials, so there is no  
information about 18 his past employment. For question 2 (“Have you received, within the past  
twelve (12) months, 19 any money from any of the following sources”), he checked yes for every  
box, then crossed out all 20 the yesses and put in his initials – it is unclear what that means, since  
he didn’t check the no box 21 for any of them. Plaintiff also states he is or was a radio music  
artist, but he doesn’t provide 22 information about how much money he made. For question 5  
(“Do you own or are you buying a 23 home?”), he checked both yes and no, crossed out the yes,  
then wrote no above the yes line and 24 yes above the no line. For question 7 (“Do you have a  
bank account?”), Plaintiff answered both yes 25 and no, then crossed out both answers and wrote in  
his initials. He also wrote in a bank (Credit 26 Bank), but he doesn’t say what the balance is. For  
question 8 (“What are your monthly 27 expenses?”), Plaintiff doesn’t list any. As such, the Court  
denied Plaintiff’s application and 1 2025. ECF No. 9. Plaintiff has failed to respond. 2 The Court  
possesses the inherent power to dismiss an action sua sponte “to achieve the 3 orderly and  
expeditious disposition of cases.” *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629-33 4 } (1962).  
Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause why this case should not be 5 dismissed  
for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court deadlines. Plaintiff shall file a 6

declaration by June 2, 2025. Notice is hereby provided that failure to file a written response will 7  
|| be deemed an admission that you do not intend to prosecute, and this case will likely be  
dismissed. 8 Thus, it is imperative the Court receive a written response by the deadline above. 9  
IT IS SO ORDERED. 10 11 Dated: May 19, 2025

12 TAA. |

THOMAS S. HIXSON

13 United States Magistrate Judge 15 16 17 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28