

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

Aragones v. Sequium Asset Solutions, LLC

No. 1:25-cv-00744-JLT-EPG (E.D. Cal. July 9, 2025) · No. 1:25-cv-00744-JLT-EPG · Decided July 9, 2025

OPINION

Aragones v. Sequium Asset Solutions, LLC.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 REYNALDO ARAGONES, Case No. 1:25-cv-00744-JLT-EPG 11 Plaintiff, FINDINGS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS 12

TO DENY PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO

v.

13 PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS

SEQUIUM ASSET SOLUTIONS, LLC,

14 (ECF No. 2) Defendant.

15 OBJECTIONS, IF ANY,

DUE WITHIN 30 DAYS

16 17 Plaintiff Reynaldo Aragonés is proceeding pro se against Sequium Asset Solutions, 18 LLC,
due to alleged erroneous reporting of his debt. (ECF No. 1). Along with his complaint, 19 Plaintiff
also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 20 § 1915.
(ECF No. 2). 21 The Court normally requires a \$405 filing fee for a civil action. However, a
federal 22 statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915, permits a plaintiff to commence a lawsuit without prepaying
a filing 23 fee. This statute permits a court to “authorize the commencement, prosecution or
defense of 24 any suit, action or proceeding, civil or criminal, or appeal therein, without
prepayment of fees 25 or security therefor, by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a
statement of all assets 26 27 28 1 such prisoner possesses that the person is unable to pay such
fees or give security therefor.” 28 2 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1).1 3 Here, Plaintiff requests that the Court
grant him IFP status. However, Plaintiff’s IFP 4 application indicates that Plaintiff has gross
wages of \$6,463.00 and take-home pay after taxes 5 of \$4260.09. (ECF No. 2 at 1). The
application also indicates that Plaintiff has \$1,400.00 in 6 checking and savings. (Id.). These funds
—especially Plaintiff’s monthly wages—are 7 sufficient to pay the filing fee in this action. 8
Therefore, the Court will recommend that Plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma 9 pauperis be

denied and that Plaintiff be required to pay the filing fee of \$405.00 for this action 10 in full. 11 Accordingly, IT IS RECOMMENDED that: 12 1. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) be denied; 13 2. Plaintiff be ordered to pay the \$405 filing fee in full should he want to proceed 14 in this case; and 15 3. Plaintiff be advised that failure to pay the filing fee in full will result in the 16 dismissal of this case. 17 These findings and recommendations will be submitted to the United States district 18 judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 19 thirty days after being served with these findings and recommendations, Plaintiff may file 20 written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate 21 22 23 1 The Ninth Circuit has held that 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) applies to all applicants for in forma 24 pauperis status, both prisoners and non-prisoners. *Hymas v. United States DOI*, 73 F.4th 763, 767 (9th Cir. 2023) ("[N]otwithstanding the carve-out for prisoners, the portion of the IFP statute authorizing 25 courts to waive fees for persons "unable to pay" remains largely unchanged from the previous version. The PLRA therefore did not alter the courts' discretion regarding filing fees as to non- 26 prisoners." (emphasis in original)); see also *Calhoun v. Stahl*, 254 F.3d 845, 845 (9th Cir. 2001) (per curiam) (provisions of § 1915 apply to non-prisoner litigants). Moreover, many district courts apply 28 27 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) to non-prisoner lawsuits. See, e.g., *Jones v. Waypoint Res. Grp. LLC*, No. 3:23-cv- 06088-TMC, 2024 WL 532356, at *1 n.1 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 3, 2024) ("[Section] 1915(a) (1) applies to 28 both prisoners and to non-prisoners who make a motion to proceed IFP."). 1 || Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any objections shall be limited to no more than 15 2 || pages including exhibits. 3 Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may result in 4 || the waiver of rights on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014) 5 || (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)). 6 7 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _ July 9, 2025 [see hey □□

9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28