

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION

Pierre Nathaniel Parker v. Peggy Horst et al.

Parker · No. 4:25-cv-00329-SRC · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri grants Pierre Nathaniel Parker’s renewed application to proceed in forma pauperis and assesses an initial partial filing fee of \$55.27 under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Court also grants Parker additional time to file an amended prisoner civil-rights complaint including all intended defendants. Parker must pay the fee and file the amended complaint by January 9, 2026, or the action may be dismissed without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephen R. Clark
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	4:25-cv-00329-SRC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A prisoner plaintiff sought leave to proceed in forma pauperis and moved for leave to file an amended complaint after the Court had previously directed him to submit an amended complaint and either pay the filing fee or submit a compliant in forma pauperis application.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- motion to amend
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- prisoner civil rights
- federal civil procedure
- in forma pauperis proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Parker satisfied the statutory requirements to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.
2. What initial partial filing fee should be assessed based on Parker's certified inmate-account statement.
3. Whether Parker's motion for leave to file an amended complaint should be construed as a request for additional time when the Court had already granted permission to add a defendant.
4. Whether Parker must include all claims and defendants he intends to pursue in the amended complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. Parker's renewed in forma pauperis application should be granted because he submitted the required affidavit and a certified inmate-account statement covering the relevant six-month period.
2. Parker must pay an initial partial filing fee of \$55.27.
3. When the Court had already granted Parker's request to add a defendant, his subsequent motion for leave to file an amended complaint was properly construed as a request for additional time to file the amended complaint.
4. Parker's amended complaint must completely replace the original complaint and include every claim and defendant he intends to pursue.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The agency having custody of the prisoner shall forward payments from the prisoner’s account to the [C]lerk of the [C]ourt each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 until the filing fees are paid.”
(Section I)

“Because the Court already granted Parker’s initial request, it construes this new motion as a request for additional time.” (Section II)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Parker is a prisoner litigant who initiated a civil-rights action and sought to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. His initial application was denied because it lacked a compliant inmate-account statement. He later filed a certified statement showing account activity from September 13, 2024, through March 13, 2025, and filed a motion for leave to amend instead of the amended complaint previously ordered by the Court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court previously denied Parker's initial in forma pauperis application without prejudice because he had not submitted a compliant inmate-account statement. The Court ordered him to pay the filing fee or renew his application and also directed him to file an amended complaint. Parker submitted a renewed application, a certified account statement, and a motion for leave to file an amended complaint. The Court granted the renewed in forma pauperis application, assessed an initial partial filing fee, construed the motion as a request for additional time, and allowed the amended complaint to be filed by January 9, 2026.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Miller v. Norris, 247 F.3d 736, 739 (8th Cir. 2001)
- In re Wireless Tel. Fed. Cost Recovery Fees Litig., 396 F.3d 922, 928 (8th Cir. 2005)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-mis/2025/pierre-nathaniel-parker-v-peggy-horst-et-al-oua6lqta>