

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Dunn v. Unified District School Clovis

No. 1:25-cv-0962 JLT BAM (E.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2025) · No. 1:25-cv-0962 JLT BAM · Decided August 15,
2025

OPINION

Dunn v. Unified District School Clovis

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 ALANA DUNN, Case No. 1:25-cv-0962 JLT BAM 12 Plaintiff, ORDER ADOPTING
FINDINGS AND

RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING

13 v. PLAINTIFF’S APPLICATION TO

PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS, AND

14 UNIFIED DISTRICT SCHOOL CLOVIS, DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO PAY THE

et al., FILING FEE WITHIN 21 DAYS 15 Defendants. (Docs. 2, 3) 16 17 Alana Dunn seeks to
proceed in forma pauperis in this action, which she initiated by filing 18 a complaint on August 5,
2025. (Docs. 1, 2.) The assigned magistrate judge reviewed the 19 application and found the
information provided was “inconsistent with a finding of poverty based 20 on household income,
stated expenses, and stated assets.” (Doc. 3 at 2.) The magistrate judge 21 noted that Plaintiff
reported an annual household income of \$91,294.80, including her own salary 22 as well as the
SSI benefits received for four children. (Id. at 2-3.) The magistrate judge found 23 Plaintiff did not
show she was unable to pay the filing fee, and recommended the Court deny the 24 request to
proceed in forma pauperis. (Id. at 3.) 25 Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Findings and
Recommendations. (Doc. 4.) Plaintiff 26 provides additional information concerning her income
since 2020 and the SSI benefits received 27 for the four children. (Id. at 7-16.) However, Plaintiff
does not dispute the finding of the 28 magistrate judge that her annual income exceeds \$90,000, or
otherwise demonstrate an inability 1 | to pay the Court’s filing fee. Thus, Plaintiffs objections do
not show either factual or legal errors 2 | by the magistrate judge. 3 According to 28 U.S.C. §
636(b)(1), this Court performed a de novo review of the case. 4 | Having carefully reviewed the
entire matter, including Plaintiff’s objections and exhibits, the 5 | Court concludes the Findings and
Recommendations are supported by the record and proper 6 | analysis. As the magistrate judge
found, Plaintiff’s income is sufficient for her to pay the filing 7 | fee and still afford necessities for
her and her dependents. See *Martinez v. Kristi Kleaners, Inc.*, 8 | 364 F.3d 1305, 1307 (11th Cir.

2004) (a litigant shows indigency when “unable to pay for the 9 | court fees and costs, and to provide necessities for himself and his dependents”). Thus, the Court 10 | ORDERS: 11 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on August 7, 2025 (Doc. 3) are 12 ADOPTED in full. 13 2. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 2) is DENIED. 14 3. Plaintiff SHALL pay the \$405.00 filing fee in full within 21 days of the date of 15 service to proceed with this action. 16 Failure to pay the filing fee as ordered will result in the Court dismissing the action 17 without prejudice. 18 19 IT IS SO ORDERED. 29 | Dated: _ August 14, 2025 Charis [Tourn
TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28