

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 22, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00980-KES-EPG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for permission to electronically file documents in his pending civil action. The district court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse-of-discretion framework; Local Rule 133(b)(3) places the decision whether to grant permission to e-file within the court's discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Prince Paul Raymond Williams v. Capital One, N.A., et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a pro se litigant should be granted permission under Eastern District of California Local Rule 133(b) to electronically file documents instead of filing and serving paper documents.

HOLDINGS

1. Under Local Rule 133(b), the court has discretion to grant or deny a pro se litigant's request for an exception permitting electronic filing, and the court denied Williams's request because the record showed that he could use ordinary paper filing and because electronic filing could encourage unnecessarily voluminous submissions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Under the Court’s Local Rules, pro se parties are required to “file and serve paper documents” and “may not utilize electronic filing except with the permission of the assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge.”” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Williams, who was unhoused and alleged that he lacked regular access to copying, mailing, and transportation facilities, requested permission to e-file all documents in the action. He had filed four cases in the same month and submitted voluminous pleadings, including a 40-page complaint in this case and a 60-page complaint in another case. The court relied on those filings and information in his in forma pauperis application to conclude that he could use ordinary paper filing and had sufficient financial resources to do so.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Williams filed this civil action on August 7, 2025, and proceeded pro se. After filing a motion to electronically file documents, he sought permission to use electronic filing instead of the paper-filing method ordinarily required for pro se parties under the court's local rules. The court denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Reddy v. Precyse Solutions LLC, 2013 WL 2603413, at *3 (E.D. Cal. June 11, 2013)