

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Glen Pickett v. Trooper Quanzell Lambert, et al.

Pickett · No. No. 25-18308 (KMW-MSJS) · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of New Jersey denies Glen Pickett’s application to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The court finds that Plaintiff’s monthly expenses do not exceed his monthly income and therefore concludes that he has not shown an inability to pay the costs of litigation. The order directs the Clerk to close the file and permits reopening upon payment of the \$405 filing fee within 14 days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karen M. Williams
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	No. 25-18308 (KMW-MSJS)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff applied to proceed in forma pauperis in a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The district court denied the application without prepayment of filing fees.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the application to determine whether plaintiff demonstrated indigence under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil rightsFederal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff demonstrated sufficient indigence to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1).

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to establish that he was unable to pay the costs of litigation because his reported monthly expenses did not exceed his monthly income; therefore, the application to proceed in forma pauperis was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“need not be absolutely destitute to proceed in forma pauperis”

“establish that [she] is unable to pay the costs of [his] suit”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff reported monthly income of \$2,071 from disability and public assistance and approximately \$1,356.58 in monthly expenses. He reported \$60 in a checking account and a motor vehicle valued at \$22,000. He stated that he had no spouse contributing income or sharing expenses and no dependents.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil action and an application to proceed in district court without prepaying fees or costs. After reviewing the application and plaintiff's reported income, expenses, assets, and household circumstances, the court denied the application and ordered the clerk to close the file, while permitting plaintiff to reopen the case by paying the \$405 filing fee within 14 days.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Douris v. Newtown Borough, Inc.*, 207 F. App'x 242, 243 (3d Cir. 2006)
- *Hurst v. Shalk*, 659 F. App'x 133, 134 (3d Cir. 2016)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CAMDEN VICINAGE! HONORABLE KAREN M, WILLIAMS GLEN PICKETT, Plaintiff, Civil Action No. 25-18308 (KMW-MSJS) TROOPER QUANZELL LAMBERT. ef al, | MEMORANDUM OPINION AND Defendants,! ORDER THIS MATTER comes before the Court by way of pro se Plaintiff Glen Pickett's ("Plaintiff") Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs ("IFP Application") (ECF No. 2) pursuant to 28 U.S.C, § 1915(a){1); and THE COURT NOTING that, having reviewed Plaintiff's IFP Application (ECF No. 2), Plaintiff declares

that he has a monthly income of \$2,071.00 from Disability and Public Assistance, and has approximately \$1,356.58 in expenses per month.

(FP Application {ff 1, 8). Plaintiff asserts that he has \$60 in his checking account and a motor vehicle valued at \$22,000. (IFP Application 4-5). Plaintiff asserts that he does not have a spouse to contribute income or share in expenses, and he does not have any dependents. Id. WHEREAS, the Third Circuit has held that an application to proceed without paying filing fees is “based on a showing of indigence,” *Douris v. Newtown Borough, Inc.*, 207 F. App’x 242, 243 (3d Cir.

2006) (citation omitted); and WHEREAS the Court notes that although a person “need not be absolutely destitute to proceed in forma pauperis,” Plaintiff must nonetheless, “establish that [she] is unable to pay the costs of [his] suit,” *Hurst vy. Shalk*, 659 F. App’x 133, 134 (3d Cir. 2016); and THE COURT FINDING that because Plaintiffs monthly expenses do not exceed his monthly income, Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that he cannot pay the costs of litigation, and thus the Court DENIES the IFP Application.

IT IS HEREBY on this “day of March, 2026, ORDERED A. Plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915 (ECF No. 1-2) is hereby DENIED. B. The clerk is ordered to close the file. Plaintiff may submit payment in the amount of \$405 to reopen the case without further action from the court. C. Failure to submit payment within 14 days from the date of this order may result in this case being terminated.

D. The Clerk of the Court shall serve a copy of this Order upon Plaintiff by regular U.S. mail. 5
Sen UXAREN M. WILLIAMS United States District Judge