

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Vincent Mota v. FBI, et al.

Mota · No. 25cv15826 (EP) (SDA) · Decided January 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of New Jersey denied Vincent Mota's application to proceed in forma pauperis without prejudice because it contained numerous unanswered questions and insufficient financial information. The court administratively terminated the action and allowed Plaintiff 30 days to either pay the required fees or submit a properly completed IFP application.

OPINION

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY VINCENT MOTA, Plaintiff, No. 25cv15826 (EP) (SDA) MEMORANDUM ORDER FBI, et al. Defendants. PADIN, District Judge. Pro se Plaintiff Vincent Mota alleges deprivation of, among others, his rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. D.E. 1 ('Complaint').

Plaintiff has neither paid the applicable \$350 filing fee for a civil case under 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a), nor the \$55 administrative fee under Appendix K to the Local Civil Rules. Plaintiff did file an application to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP") under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). D.E. 1-1 ('IFP Application'). Upon review of Plaintiff's IFP Application, however, it appears that he has not provided all the necessary information required by the instructions set forth in the IFP Application, which requires applicants to "[c]omplete all questions in [the] application" and instructs applicants "not [to] leave any blanks: if the answer to a question is '0,' 'none,' or 'not applicable (N/A),' write that response." See IFP Application at 1.

Here, Plaintiff's IFP Application has numerous blank entries, including, but not limited to, his income from "Self-employment," "Income from real property," "Interest and dividends," "Gifts," "Alimony," "Child support," "Retirement," "Disability," "Unemployment payments," and "Public-assistance" in Question 1, the dates of employment and his gross monthly pay from the job he listed in Question 2, and all of Questions 3, 5, and 7.

See *id.* The Court is therefore "unable to determine whether Plaintiff has the ability to pay fees and costs." *Watson v. Washington Twp. of Gloucester Cty. Pub. Sch. Dist.*, No. 09-3650, 2009 WL 2778282, at *2 (D.N.J. Aug. 28, 2009).

Accordingly, IT IS, on this 28" day of January 2026, ORDERED that Plaintiffs IFP Application, D.E. 1-1, is DENIED without prejudice; and it is further ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall

mark the Complaint, D.E. 1, received; and it is further ORDERED the Clerk of Court shall ADMINISTRATIVELY TERMINATE this action due to Plaintiff's failure to satisfy the filing fee requirement or alternatively submit a properly completed IFP application; and it is further ORDERED that if Plaintiff wishes to reopen this action he shall either, within 30 days of entry of this Order: (1) pay the \$405 civil filing and administrative fees, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) and Appendix K to the Local Civil Rules; or (2) submit a properly completed IFP application on Form AO 239, available at <https://www.njd-uscourts.gov/sites/njd/files/forms/AO-239.pdf>; and it is further ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall send Plaintiff a blank Form AO 239 by regular mail; and it is finally ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff by regular mail.

Soul, Vabo Evelyn Padin, U.S.D.J.