

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Roderick Washington v. Ronald Broomfield, et al.

No. 1:25-cv-00958-KES-SAB (PC) · No. No. 1:25-cv-00958-KES-SAB (PC) · Decided November 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California dismissed Roderick Washington’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action without prejudice after he failed to pay the filing fee. The court directed the Clerk to close the case following the expiration of an extended payment deadline.

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	November 17, 2025
DOCKET	No. 1:25-cv-00958-KES-SAB (PC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A state prisoner brought a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and sought to proceed in forma pauperis. After the application was denied under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), the court ordered plaintiff to pay the filing fee; following an extension and continued nonpayment, the district court dismissed the action without prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Roderick Washington v. Ronald Broomfield, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice after plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee following denial of in forma pauperis status, an order requiring full payment, an extension of time, and a warning of dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. Because plaintiff failed to pay the required filing fee by the extended deadline after being denied in forma pauperis status and warned that nonpayment would result in dismissal, the action was dismissed without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Without such payment, the action cannot proceed before the Court.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Roderick Washington, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this § 1983 civil rights action and applied to proceed in forma pauperis. The court denied that application under the prisoner three-strikes provision, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and ordered him to pay the \$405 filing fee in full. Although the court granted a thirty-day extension and warned that nonpayment would result in dismissal, Washington failed to pay before the extended deadline expired.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge recommended denying plaintiff’s in forma pauperis application under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and requiring payment of the filing fee. The district court adopted those recommendations, ordered plaintiff to pay \$405 within thirty days, granted a thirty-day extension, and warned that failure to pay would result in dismissal. Plaintiff did not pay by the extended deadline, so the court dismissed the action without prejudice and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Saddozai v. Davis, 35 F.4th 705, 709 (9th Cir. 2022)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9 10 RODERICK WASHINGTON, No. 1:25-cv-00958-KES-SAB (PC) 11 Plaintiff, ORDER
DISMISSING ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE FOR FAILURE TO PAY FILING 12 v. FEE 13
RONALD BROOMFIELD, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 17 Plaintiff Roderick Washington is a
state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights 18 action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On August 11, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued 19 findings and recommendations
recommending that plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma 20 pauperis be denied pursuant to
28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and that plaintiff be required to pay the filing 21 fee in full to proceed with
this action. Doc. 4. 22 On September 15, 2025, the Court adopted the findings and

recommendations and ordered 23 plaintiff to pay the \$405.00 filing fee in full within thirty (30) days.

Doc. 5. Plaintiff was warned 24 that if he failed to pay the filing fee within the specified time, this action would be dismissed 25 without further notice. Id. at 2. On September 26, 2025, plaintiff was granted a 30-day extension 26 of time to pay the filing fee, with the fee due within 30 days of the service of the order on 27 September 26. Doc. 7. Despite the Court's warning, and despite receiving an extension of time, 28 plaintiff has failed to pay the required filing fee and the extended deadline for him to do so has 1 | expired.

Without such payment, the action cannot proceed before the Court. See *Saddozai v. 2 | Davis*, 35 F.4th 705, 709 (9th Cir. 2022). 3 Accordingly, 4 1. This action is dismissed without prejudice; and 5 2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case. 6 7 g | IT ISSO ORDERED. _ 9 Dated: _ November 16, 2025 4h 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28