

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Leena Hannonen; Agnes Bradshaw v. Mark McCloskey, et al.

Hannonen · No. 24-cv-2408-BAS-BLM · Decided October 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The court addresses a motion to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal in an action involving two plaintiffs. Because only Leena Hannonen submitted an application, the court orders Agnes Bradshaw to file a separate IFP application or pay the appellate filing fee by November 13, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cynthia Bashant
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of California
DECIDED	October 30, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-2408-BAS-BLM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff Leena Hannonen moved for leave to appeal in forma pauperis after filing a notice of appeal. The district court ordered co-plaintiff Agnes Bradshaw to submit her own IFP application or pay the appellate filing fee.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Leena Hannonen, Agnes Bradshaw v. Mark McCloskey, et al.

TOPICS

[appellate procedure](#) [civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[Appellate procedure](#) [Civil procedure](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether multiple plaintiffs seeking to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal must each demonstrate inability to pay the filing fee.

HOLDINGS

1. When multiple plaintiffs in a single action seek to proceed in forma pauperis, each named plaintiff must submit a separate application and demonstrate inability to pay before the plaintiffs may proceed in forma pauperis.

KEY QUOTATIONS

- “Where there are multiple plaintiffs in a single action, the plaintiffs may not proceed in forma pauperis unless all of them demonstrate inability to pay the filing fee.”* (at 1)
- “Thus, each named plaintiff must submit separate applications to proceed as a pauper before a court will grant multiple plaintiffs in forma pauperis status in one action.”* (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Leena Hannonen and Agnes Bradshaw were plaintiffs in the underlying district-court action and sought to appeal in forma pauperis. Hannonen submitted the Ninth Circuit's Form 4 and a notice of appeal, but no IFP application for Bradshaw was before the court. The court therefore lacked information about Bradshaw's ability to pay the appellate filing fee.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The plaintiffs sought to appeal and proceed in forma pauperis. Hannonen submitted an IFP motion and affidavit along with a notice of appeal, but Bradshaw had not submitted a separate application. The district court directed Bradshaw to file an IFP application by November 13, 2025, or pay the filing fee.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Tom v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A., No. 19-cv-00545-JMS-KJM, 2019 WL 13215306, at *1 (D. Haw. Oct. 31, 2019)
- Anderson v. California, No. 10-cv-2216-MMA-AJB, 2010 WL 4316996, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2010)
- Remmert v. Newsome, No. 23-cv-00050-ADA-HBK, 2023 WL 1806277, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2023)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 LEENA HANNONEN; AGNES Case No. 24-cv-2408-BAS-BLM
BRADSHAW, 12 ORDER FOR PLAINTIFF AGNES Plaintiffs, 13 BRADSHAW TO FILE IFP v.
APPLICATION OR PAY FEE 14 MARK MCCLOSKEY, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Pending
before the Court is Plaintiff Leena Hannonen’s motion for leave to appeal 18 in forma pauperis
(“IFP”).

Under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24, “a party to a 19 district-court action who desires to appeal in forma pauperis must file a motion in the 20 district court.” Fed. R. App. P. 24. Plaintiff is self-represented and completed the Ninth 21 Circuit’s Form 4: Motion and Affidavit for Permission to Proceed in Forma Pauperis. (ECF 22 No. 36-1.) Plaintiff’s motion also included a Notice of Appeal.

(ECF No. 36.) 23 However, the Court notes that only one Plaintiff who is seeking to appeal completed 24 the application. The Court lacks information as to whether Plaintiff Agnes Bradshaw 25 should be permitted to proceed IFP. “Where there are multiple plaintiffs in a single action, 26 the plaintiffs may not proceed in forma pauperis unless all of them demonstrate inability 27 to pay the filing fee.” *Tom v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A.*, No. 19-cv-00545-JMS-KJM, 2019 28 WL 13215306, at *1 (D.

Haw. Oct. 31, 2019) (quotation omitted); see also *Anderson v. 1 || California*, No. 10-cv-2216-MMA-AJB, 2010 WL 4316996, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2010) 2 addition, although only one filing fee needs to be paid per case, if multiple plaintiffs 3 || seek to proceed in forma pauperis, each plaintiff must qualify for IFP status.”). “Thus, each 4 ||named plaintiff must submit separate applications to proceed as a pauper before a court 5 || will grant multiple plaintiffs in forma pauperis status in one action.” *Remmert v. Newsome*, 6 || No. 23-cv-00050-ADA-HBK, 2023 WL 1806277, at *1 (E.D.

Cal. Jan. 31, 2023). 7 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff Agnes Bradshaw to file an application to 8 || proceed IFP on or before November 13, 2025. Otherwise, Plaintiff Agnes Bradshaw will 9 to pay the filling fee to appeal. 10 IT IS SO ORDERED. 11 12 || DATED: October 30, 2025 (yatta Bahar B H n. Cynthia Bashant, Chief Judge United States District Court 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28