

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Yi Li v. Trump Campaign Staff, et al.

Li · No. 2:25-cv-01336-GMN-NJK · Decided December 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada denied without prejudice Yi Li’s application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court identified unexplained discrepancies in reported income and found that the application did not establish an inability to pay the filing fee, requiring Li by January 2, 2026, either to pay the fee or submit a complete renewed application with a written explanation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nancy J. Koppe
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 8, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01336-GMN-NJK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff applied under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court denied the application without prejudice and required Plaintiff either to pay the filing fee or submit a complete long-form application with a written explanation of his inability to pay.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The determination whether an applicant has demonstrated an inability to pay under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) is committed to the court's discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Yi Li v. Trump Campaign Staff, et al.

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure in forma pauperis proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff demonstrated an inability to pay the filing fee sufficient to qualify for in forma pauperis status under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1).

HOLDINGS

1. A court may deny an application to proceed in forma pauperis when the applicant's financial information contains unexplained discrepancies or indicates that the applicant can pay the filing fee while still providing for life's necessities.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“there is no formula set forth by statute, regulation, or case law to determine when someone is poor enough to earn IFP status.” (at 1)

“While an applicant need not be absolutely destitute to qualify for a waiver of costs and fees, the applicant must demonstrate an inability to pay those costs while still providing for the necessities of life.” (at 1-2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff reported gross pay of \$3,565 from approximately 27 months of work at Amazon, while elsewhere reporting average monthly income of \$2,677.14. He listed monthly expenses of \$1,582.28, reported no savings, and did not identify expected future income despite stating elsewhere that he expected unemployment benefits or new employment. The court found these discrepancies and the apparent excess of income over expenses insufficiently explained.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this action and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court reviewed the financial information in the application and related materials, identified unexplained discrepancies and an apparent surplus of income over expenses, and denied the application without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Flores v. Colvin, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93236, at *2 (D. Nev. May 22, 2014), adopted, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93234 (D. Nev. July 9, 2014)
- Escobedo v. Applebees, 787 F.3d 1226, 1235 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948)
- O'Neal v. Denise, 2018 WL 1100903, at *1 (D. Nev. Jan. 11, 2018), adopted, 2018 WL 1092334 (D. Nev. Feb. 27, 2018)
- Martinez v. Kristi Kleaners, Inc., 364 F.3d 1035, 1037 n.3 (11th Cir. 2004)
- Olteanu v. Schneider, 2025 WL 1880283, at *3 (D. Nev. May 6, 2025)

- Abadi v. Target Corp., 2023 WL 6796558, at *8 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 13, 2023), adopted, 2025 WL 1603265 (D. Nev. June 5, 2025)
- Brunson v. Soc. Sec., 2019 WL 6709544, at *1 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2019), adopted, 2019 WL 6700193 (D. Nev. Dec. 9, 2019)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-nevada/2025/yi-li-v-trump-campaign-staff-et-al-67kqesk8>