

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Williams v. Capital One, N.A.

No. 1:25-cv-00980-KES-EPG (E.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2025) · No. 1:25-cv-00980-KES-EPG · Decided August 22,
2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied pro se plaintiff Prince Paul Raymond Williams’s motion for permission to electronically file documents. The court concluded that his filing history and financial information showed he could use the ordinary paper filing process and expressed concern that electronic filing could encourage unnecessarily voluminous submissions.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9 10 PRINCE PAUL RAYMOND WILLIAMS, Case No. 1:25-cv-00980-KES-EPG 11 Plaintiff,
ORDER DENYING MOTION TO 12 ELECTRONICALLY FILE (E-FILE) v. DOCUMENTS 13
CAPITAL ONE, N.A., et al., (ECF No. 8) 14 Defendants. 15 16 17 I. INTRODUCTION 18
Plaintiff Prince Paul Raymond Williams (“Plaintiff”) proceeds pro se in this civil action 19 filed
on August 7, 2025.

Before the Court is his motion to electronically file (e-file) documents in 20 this case. (ECF No.
8). For the reasons explained below, the Court will deny the motion. 21 II. BACKGROUND 22
Plaintiff has filed four cases so far this month: 1:25-cv-957-JLT-SAB; 1:25-cv-973-KES- 23
HBK; 1:25-cv-980-KES-EPG (his instant case); and 1:25-cv-981-JLT-EPG. Plaintiff’s filings in
24 his cases have been voluminous.

In this case, he has filed a 40-page complaint (including the civil cover sheet) (ECF No. 1)
(emphasis added), a motion for a temporary restraining order, and a 25 motion to e-file
documents. In his other case before the undersigned, 1:25-cv-981-JLT-EPG, he 26 has filed a 60-
page complaint (including the civil cover sheet) (ECF No. 1) (emphasis added), a 27 motion for a
temporary restraining order, and his motion to e-file documents.

28 1 On August 7, 2025, Plaintiff filed an IFP application, which states he worked until July 2 17,
2025, and was paid approximately \$940. (ECF No. 2, p.1). The Court directed Plaintiff to 3
submit the long form in forma pauperis (IFP) application to better understand his finances. (ECF 4
No. 6). Plaintiff states that he “is unhoused and without regular access to copying or mailing 5
facilities.

He lacks the means to personally attend the Fresno courthouse personally to file every 6 subsequent paper or receive timely [notice].” (ECF No. 8, p. 2). Further, Plaintiff alleges he 7 “lacks the financial resources to pay copying, postage, or travel costs necessary to file paper 8 documents in person or by mail for every submission.” (Id. p. 3) (emphasis added).

Accordingly, 9 he asks that he be granted leave to e-file all documents. 10 III. ANALYSIS 11 Under the Court’s Local Rules, pro se parties are required to “file and serve paper 12 documents” and “may not utilize electronic filing except with the permission of the assigned 13 Judge or Magistrate Judge.” Local Rule 133(b)(2) (emphasis omitted). Any request for an 14 exception to this Rule must be submitted as a stipulation between the parties or via a motion.

15 Local Rule 133(b)(3). And it is within the Court’s discretion to grant or deny such a request. 16 Reddy v. Precyse Solutions LLC, 2013 WL 2603413, at *3 (E.D. Cal. June 11, 2013). 17 After considering Plaintiff’s motion and the above legal standards, the Court declines to 18 exercise its discretion to grant Plaintiff permission to e-file.

First, Plaintiff’s voluminous filings in 19 four cases this month show that he can use the ordinary paper method for filing documents and is 20 not without regular access to copying or mailing facilities. Moreover, information in his IFP 21 application demonstrates that he has the financial resources necessary to file paper documents. 22 Second, Plaintiff’s motion seeks permission to e-file in part to allow him to file 23 voluminous documents with the Court.

Plaintiff’s filings in this and other cases pending in this Court show that Plaintiff frequently files voluminous pleadings. The Court is concerned that 24 permitting electronic filing may encourage Plaintiff to file unnecessarily voluminous filings, 25 taxing the limited resources of the Court. 26 \\\ 27 \\\ 28 1 IV. CONCLUSION 2 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs motion to e-file documents is denied.

(ECF 3 | No. 8). 4; IT IS SO ORDERED. 6] Dated: _ August 22, 2025 [Je hey — 7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28