

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK

Ronald Plaza v. Kathleen Masiello et al.

Plaza · No. 9:25-CV-1466 · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of New York denied Ronald Plaza's application to proceed in forma pauperis without prejudice because it did not reflect his post-release financial condition. The court also denied his motion for injunctive relief as premature, struck the inmate authorization form, and required him to provide an updated address and either pay the filing fee or renew his IFP application within thirty days, warning that failure to comply would result in dismissal without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Anthony J. Brindisi
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	9:25-CV-1466
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a pro se civil-rights complaint, an application to proceed in forma pauperis, and a motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunctive relief. After the action was administratively closed for failure to comply with the filing-fee requirement, it was reopened when plaintiff filed an inmate authorization form. The district court denied the IFP application and request for injunctive relief without prejudice, struck the authorization form as unnecessary, and ordered plaintiff to provide a current address and either pay the filing fee or renew his IFP application.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court exercised discretion in evaluating eligibility for in forma pauperis status and in determining whether dismissal for failure to prosecute or comply with procedural requirements was warranted.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court decision

PARTIES

Ronald Plaza v. Kathleen Masiello et al.

TOPICS

civil procedure

injunctions

service of process

civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Civil rights

Prisoner litigation

Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff's IFP application should be granted when it did not reflect his current post-release financial condition.
2. Whether plaintiff was required to provide the court with a current address and comply with the filing-fee requirement before the action could proceed.
3. Whether plaintiff's motion for temporary and preliminary injunctive relief should be denied as premature because the action could not proceed absent compliance with the filing-fee and address requirements.

HOLDINGS

1. The IFP application was denied without prejudice and with leave to renew because, following plaintiff's release from custody, the application did not permit the court to determine his current economic need.
2. Before the action could proceed, plaintiff was required within thirty days to notify the court of his current address and either pay the \$405 filing fee or submit a renewed IFP application addressing his current post-release financial condition.
3. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief was denied without prejudice as premature because the action could not proceed until plaintiff supplied a current address and complied with the filing-fee requirement.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"This matter cannot proceed without plaintiff's notification to the Court of his current address." (at 2)

"Accordingly, plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief is denied without prejudice as premature." (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed the complaint and related motions while confined at Wallkill Correctional Facility. He was released on parole on November 10, 2025, after submitting an IFP application and inmate authorization form that did not reflect his post-release financial condition. Plaintiff also had not provided the court with a current mailing address after release.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff commenced the action in October 2025. The court administratively closed the case on October 22, 2025, because plaintiff had not complied with the filing-fee requirement, then reopened it after receiving an

inmate authorization form. The court determined that plaintiff's release from custody made the existing IFP application insufficient to assess his current financial condition and that the court lacked a reliable current address for service and case communications. Plaintiff was given thirty days to update his address and satisfy the filing-fee requirement, with dismissal without prejudice to follow if he failed to comply.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Cash v. Bernstein, No. 09-CV-1922, 2010 WL 5185047, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 26, 2010)
- DiGianni v. Pearson Educ., No. 10-CV-0206, 2010 WL 1741373, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 30, 2010)
- Dansby v. Albany Cnty. Corr. Facility, No. 6:95-CV-1525 (RSP/RWS), 1996 WL 172699, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. Apr. 10, 1996)
- Perkins v. King, No. 84-3310, slip op. at 4 (5th Cir. May 19, 1985)
- Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 (1962)
- Freeman v. Lundrigan, No. 95-CV-1190 (RSP/RWS), 1996 WL 481534, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. Aug. 22, 1996)