

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Gremmels v. Apple Inc.

No. 25-cv-03722-LJC (N.D. Cal. June 10, 2025) · No. 25-cv-03722-LJC · Decided June 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The court addresses Plaintiff Christian Gremmels’ response to an order to show cause and correspondence seeking a PACER fee waiver. The court extends the deadline to file an amended complaint to July 28, 2025, warns that failure to correct identified defects may result in a recommendation of dismissal, and denies the PACER fee exemption request without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lisa J. Cisneros
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 10, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-03722-LJC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court addressed the pro se plaintiff's response to an order to show cause and correspondence construed as a request for a PACER fee waiver.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district-court order

TOPICS

- pleadings costs civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure Federal courts Pro se litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should extend Plaintiff's deadline to file an amended complaint in light of his questions about the order to show cause and alleged delay in receiving it.
- Whether Plaintiff established entitlement to a PACER fee exemption.

HOLDINGS

1. The court extended Plaintiff's deadline to file an amended complaint to July 28, 2025.
2. Plaintiff's request for a PACER fee exemption was denied without prejudice because he did not show that an exemption was necessary to avoid unreasonable burdens and promote public access to information.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“If Plaintiff does not file an amended Complaint, or if his amended Complaint does not correct the defects identified in the Court’s Order to Show Cause at ECF No. 6, the undersigned may recommend dismissal of this action.” (at 1)

“Although the Court granted Plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis, in forma pauperis status alone does not support a request to waive PACER fees.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, was ordered to file an amended complaint after the court identified pleading defects. He mailed his response directly to the magistrate judge rather than the Clerk's Office and asserted that delay in receiving the order affected his ability to comply. Plaintiff also requested an exemption from PACER fees, stating that he needed the exemption to electronically file documents.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by June 4, 2025. Plaintiff instead mailed a response to the magistrate judge, which was redirected to the Clerk's Office and filed. The court extended the amendment deadline to July 28, 2025 and warned that failure to cure the deficiencies could result in a recommendation of dismissal. The court also denied Plaintiff's PACER fee-exemption request without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004)
- 2016 WL 97450, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 8, 2016)