

**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.

OPINION

Broomfield

PER CURIAM.

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/roderick-washington-v-ronald-broomfield-et-al-kxtpn4o0>