

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Maria Isabel Alonso v. Appsketiers Inc., et al.

Alonso · No. 25-16751 (JXN) (JSA) · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of New Jersey denied Maria Isabel Alonso’s application to proceed in forma pauperis, concluding that she could pay the filing fee without being deprived of life’s necessities. The court administratively terminated the matter without filing the complaint and administratively terminated the defendants’ motion to dismiss. The order permitted the plaintiff to pay the filing fee by January 5, 2026, in which event the matter would be reopened.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Julien Xavier Neals
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	25-16751 (JXN) (JSA)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. Defendants moved to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). The court denied the IFP application, administratively terminated the matter without filing or considering the complaint, and administratively terminated the motion to dismiss.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The decision whether to grant or deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis is reviewed for abuse of discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum order from a federal district court with no reporter citation.
PARTIES	Maria Isabel Alonso v. Appsketiers Inc., Jeremy Davenport, Sean Cook, Nick Bugara, The Tea App, Spill the Tea Inc.

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

in forma pauperis proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff established eligibility to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.
2. What procedural consequence should follow from denying the IFP application before the complaint was filed.
3. Whether Defendants' motion to dismiss should remain pending after administrative termination of the action.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to meet her burden of demonstrating that she was unable to pay the \$405 filing fee without being deprived of the necessities of life; therefore, the IFP application was denied.
2. When the IFP application was denied, the complaint would not be filed or considered unless Plaintiff paid the filing fee; the matter was therefore administratively terminated rather than dismissed.
3. Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6) motion was administratively terminated because the complaint was not filed or considered while Plaintiff had not paid the filing fee.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The in forma pauperis statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915, ‘is designed to ensure that indigent litigants have meaningful access to the federal courts.’”

“As a result, Plaintiff’s Complaint will not be filed or considered by the Court until Plaintiff pays the filing fee.”

“Plaintiff is informed that administrative termination is not a “dismissal” for purposes of the statute of limitations”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff reported monthly income of \$2,200 and monthly expenses of \$800 in her IFP application. She also stated that she could pay the filing fee later if the fee were waived temporarily. Based on this financial information, the court concluded that Plaintiff could pay the \$405 filing fee without being deprived of the necessities of life.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was initiated in the District of New Jersey with Plaintiff's complaint and IFP application. While Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6) motion was pending, the court determined that Plaintiff had not established eligibility for IFP status because her reported income and expenses indicated that she could pay the filing fee. The court therefore directed administrative termination without filing the complaint, while allowing Plaintiff to pay the fee and reopen the matter by January 5, 2026.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Deutsch v. United States, 67 F.3d 1080, 1084 (3d Cir. 1995)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324, 109 S. Ct. 1827, 104 L. Ed. 2d 338 (1989)
- Cotto v. Tennis, 369 F. App'x 321, 322 (3d Cir. 2010)
- Pew v. Extraction Team Members, Civ. No. 16-91, 2016 WL 2958767, at *1 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 25, 2016)
- Pew v. Extraction Team Members, 2016 WL 2977303 (W.D. Pa. May 20, 2016)
- Shahin v. Secretary of Delaware, 532 F. App'x 123, 124 (3d Cir. 2013)
- Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948)
- Roberts v. Township of Horsham, Civ. No. 94-1821, 1994 WL 384934, at *1 (E.D. Pa. July 19, 1994)
- Dasilva v. Sheriff's Department, 413 F. App'x 498, 502 (3d Cir. 2011)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-new-jersey/2025/maria-isabel-alonso-v-appsketiers-inc-et-al-8hrviv4v>