

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Evelyn Padin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
DECIDED	January 28, 2026
DOCKET	25cv15826 (EP) (SDA)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a civil-rights complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis without paying the filing and administrative fees. The court reviewed the IFP application before allowing the action to proceed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the IFP application to determine whether it contained sufficient information to assess plaintiff's ability to pay fees and costs.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished and nonprecedential memorandum order
PARTIES	Vincent Mota v. FBI, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- due process

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's incomplete in forma pauperis application should be granted.
2. What procedural action should be taken when a plaintiff neither pays the filing and administrative fees nor submits a sufficiently complete in forma pauperis application.

HOLDINGS

1. An in forma pauperis application containing numerous blank responses that prevent the court from determining the applicant's ability to pay fees and costs must be denied without prejudice.
2. When a plaintiff neither satisfies the filing-fee requirement nor submits a properly completed IFP application, the court may administratively terminate the action without prejudice and provide an opportunity to reopen it upon payment of the fees or submission of a compliant application.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court is therefore “unable to determine whether Plaintiff has the ability to pay fees and costs.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Vincent Mota filed a pro se civil-rights complaint against the FBI and other defendants. He did not pay the \$350 civil filing fee or the \$55 administrative fee, but submitted an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The application left numerous required fields blank, including information concerning income, employment, and all of Questions 3, 5, and 7, preventing the court from determining whether he could pay the required fees and costs.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a complaint alleging violations including the First and Fourteenth Amendments and submitted an IFP application. The court found that the application contained numerous required omissions, denied it without prejudice, administratively terminated the action, and allowed plaintiff 30 days to pay the fees or submit a properly completed IFP application to reopen the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Watson v. Washington Twp. of Gloucester Cty. Pub. Sch. Dist.*, No. 09-3650, 2009 WL 2778282, at *2 (D.N.J. Aug. 28, 2009)