

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

OPINION

Li

PER CURIAM.

1

2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 5 Yi Li, Case No. 2:25-cv-01336-GMN-NJK 6 Plaintiff(s), ORDER 7 v. [Docket No. 3] 8
Trump Campaign Staff, et al., 9 Defendant(s). 10 This is one of five cases that Plaintiff filed in
quick succession.¹ Plaintiff requests authority 11 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 to proceed in
forma pauperis. Docket No. 3. 12 The Court may authorize the commencement of an action
without prepayment of fees and 13 costs, or security therefor, by a person who has shown an
inability to pay such costs. 28 U.S.C. § 14 1915(a)(1). A determination of whether the plaintiff has
shown an inability to pay is a matter left 15 to the discretion of the Court. See, e.g., Flores v.
Colvin, 2014 U.S. Dist. Lexis 93236, at *2 (D. 16 Nev. May 22, 2014), adopted, 2014 U.S. Dist.
Lexis 93234 (D. Nev. July 9, 2014). The Ninth 17 Circuit has recognized that “there is no formula
set forth by statute, regulation, or case law to 18 determine when someone is poor enough to earn
IFP status.” Escobedo v. Applebees, 787 F.3d 19 1226, 1235 (9th Cir. 2015). While an applicant
need not be absolutely destitute to qualify for a 20 waiver of costs and fees, the applicant must
demonstrate an inability to pay those costs while still 21 providing for the necessities of life.
Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 22 (1948). Courts may look beyond
an in forma pauperis application to determine an applicant’s true 23 financial condition. O’Neal v.
Denise, 2018 WL 1100903, at *1 (D. Nev. Jan. 11, 2018) (quoting 24 Martinez v. Kristi Kleaners,
Inc., 364 F.3d 1035, 1037 n.3 (11th Cir. 2004)), adopted, 2018 WL 25 26 1 See also Li v. The
Siegel Group, Inc., Case No. 2:25-cv-01342-CDS-BNW (D. Nev. July 22, 2025); Li v. North Las
Vegas Police Department, Case No. 2:25-cv-1348-APG-NJK (D. Nev.

27 July 24, 2025); Li v. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Case No. 2:25-cv-01349-
CDS-

MDC (D. Nev. July 24, 2025); Li v. Amazon.com, Inc., Case No. 2:25-cv-01381-RFB-DJA (D. 28
Nev. July 28, 2025). 1} 1092334 (D. Nev. Feb. 27, 2018). “Skepticism of [in forma pauperis]
status is warranted when 2|| [in forma pauperis] plaintiffs wage aggressive litigation campaigns,
especially in multiple cases 3] simultaneously.” Olteanu v. Schneider, 2025 WL 1880283, at *3
(D. Nev. May 6, 2025) (quoting 4| Abadi v. Target Corp., 2023 WL 6796558, at *8 (E.D. Penn.

Oct. 13, 2023), adopted, 2025 WL 1603265 (D. Nev. June 5, 2025). 6 Plaintiffs application identifies \$3,565 in gross pay from working at Amazon for 27 7|| months, but represents elsewhere that Plaintiff's average monthly income has been only \$2,677.14. See Docket No. 3 at 1-2.? The application also identifies no future expected income, see id. at 1, 9] even though Plaintiff states elsewhere that he expects to secure unemployment benefits or new 10] employment, see Docket No. 3-1. No explanation is provided as to these discrepancies as to past 11] income or future income. Moreover, Plaintiff's monthly expenses are significantly lower at only 12} \$1,582.28. See Docket No. 3 at 5. It is not clear how Plaintiff would have no money in savings 13] given his years' long earnings that significantly exceed expenses, nor is it clear why Plaintiff would be deemed unable to pay the filing fee given that his expenses are less than his reported income. 15 Accordingly, the Court DENIES without prejudice Plaintiffs application to proceed in 16] forma pauperis. No later than January 2, 2026, Plaintiff must either (1) pay the filing fee or (2) 17] file another long form application to proceed in forma pauperis and a separate written explanation 18] as to how it is that he cannot pay the filing fee. If Plaintiff chooses to renew his request to proceed 19] in forma pauperis, he must ensure that his request is complete and accurate. Failure to comply 20] with this order may result in dismissal. The Clerk's Office is INSTRUCTED to send Plaintiff the long form application to proceed in forma pauperis. 22 IT IS SO ORDERED. 23 Dated: December 8, 2025 ise □ Nancy J. Koppe, _ 25 United States-Magistrate Judge 26) ————
? This monthly income greatly exceeds amounts that have led to denial of in forma pauperis 27|| status. See, e.g., Brunson v. Soc. Sec., 2019 WL 6709544, at *1 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2019) (denying in forma pauperis status based on monthly income of \$1,397), adopted, 2019 WL 6700193 (D. Nev. Dec. 9, 2019),