

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Marcus Gaston v. Fason, Papoosha and Santiago

Gaston · No. 3:26-cv-00817 (SVN) · Decided June 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut grants Marcus Gaston's motion to proceed in forma pauperis in a pro se prisoner civil rights action. The court finds that his limited income and assets demonstrate inability to pay the applicable filing and administrative fees without serious hardship.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Thomas O. Farrish
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
DECIDED	June 15, 2026
DOCKET	3:26-cv-00817 (SVN)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff filed a prisoner civil rights complaint and a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court evaluated whether the plaintiff demonstrated inability to pay the applicable filing and administrative fees under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court ruling; precedential status not stated
PARTIES	Marcus Gaston v. Fason, Papoosha, Santiago

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff demonstrated that he was unable to pay the fees required to commence the action and therefore qualified to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).

HOLDINGS

1. A prisoner plaintiff qualifies to proceed in forma pauperis when the plaintiff demonstrates that paying the required fees would constitute a serious hardship, meaning the plaintiff cannot pay or provide security for the costs while still being able to provide the necessities of life. Gaston made that showing and was entitled to proceed in forma pauperis.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“He need not “be absolutely destitute to enjoy the benefits of the [in forma pauperis] statute.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Marcus Gaston, an inmate at Walker Correctional Institution, alleged that a correctional officer confiscated his legal documents and that officers from the Department of Correction's intelligence unit were targeting him. He reported no income and few assets, with approximately \$17.10 in cash, checking, or savings accounts and four deposits of approximately \$50.00 during the preceding six months. He stated that he did not provide monetary support to others and did not spend money on necessities beyond what the Department of Correction provided.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Marcus Gaston, an inmate, filed a pro se civil rights complaint against correctional officers together with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. The court reviewed his financial information and ruled on the IFP motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Fiebelkorn v. United States, 77 Fed. Cl. 59, 62 (2007)
- Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948)