

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Meloniece M. Dukes v. Temps Plus Incorporated

No. CV-25-04480-PHX-SHD (D. Ariz. Dec. 11, 2025) · No. No. CV-25-04480-PHX-SHD · Decided December 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona denied Meloniece Dukes’s application to proceed in forma pauperis because her reported monthly income exceeded her expenses and appeared sufficient to pay the filing fee. The court also noted inconsistencies in Dukes’s financial disclosures in this and other cases and ordered her to pay the filing fee by December 23, 2025, or face dismissal without further notice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	No. CV-25-04480-PHX-SHD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a civil action and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court denied the application and ordered Plaintiff to pay the filing fee, subject to dismissal if she failed to do so.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the sufficiency and credibility of the allegations in the IFP application to determine whether Plaintiff demonstrated inability to pay court costs while affording the necessities of life.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Meloniece M. Dukes v. Temps Plus Incorporated

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- in forma pauperis proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff demonstrated that she was unable to pay the court's filing fees while still affording the necessities of life.
2. Whether inconsistencies between Plaintiff's current and prior IFP applications undermined the credibility of her financial assertions.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's IFP application failed to demonstrate that she was unable to pay the court's filing fees while affording the necessities of life, so the application was properly denied.
2. Material inconsistencies between Plaintiff's current and prior IFP applications undermined the credibility of her current financial assertions and independently supported denial of IFP status.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“An affidavit in support of an IFP application is sufficient where it alleges that the affiant cannot pay the court costs and still afford the necessities of life.” (at 1)

“IT IS ORDERED that Dukes’ IFP Application (Doc. 2) is DENIED.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Dukes reported monthly disability income of \$4,158, monthly expenses of \$2,850, ownership of a 2017 Land Rover valued at \$15,000, and three minor dependents. Her reported income exceeded her expenses by \$1,308 per month. The court also noted that her financial disclosures in other District of Arizona cases varied substantially, including differences in age, dependents, income, home ownership, and vehicle ownership.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Dukes filed the action and an IFP application on December 4, 2025. The court reviewed the financial information in the application, compared it with inconsistent financial disclosures in other cases, denied IFP status, and ordered payment of the filing fee by December 23, 2025. The court directed the Clerk to dismiss the action without further notice if the fee was not paid.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Escobedo v. Applebees, 787 F.3d 1226 (9th Cir. 2015)
- Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948)
- Dukes v. United States, 25-cv-1124-PHX-JFM (D. Ariz. May 2025) (Doc. 10)

