

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Richard Woods v. T. Taylor, et al.

No. 1:25-cv-01449-SKO, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (December 4, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders pro se plaintiff Richard Woods to submit a complete inmate trust account statement and a declaration explaining all deposits and withdrawals during the relevant six-month period. The court warns that failure to comply within 14 days may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed for failure to obey court orders and failure to prosecute.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sheila K. Oberto
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01449-SKO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	In a prisoner civil-rights action, the court reviewed Plaintiff's submission in support of his application to proceed in forma pauperis and ordered him to provide a complete inmate trust account statement and a declaration explaining deposits and withdrawals.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the adequacy of Plaintiff's inmate trust account submission to determine whether it contained sufficient information to evaluate his eligibility to proceed in forma pauperis.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- civil procedure
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- prisoner litigation
- in forma pauperis proceedings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's one-page inmate trust account statement was sufficient for the court to determine his eligibility to proceed in forma pauperis.
2. Whether Plaintiff should be required to submit a complete six-month inmate trust account statement and a declaration explaining deposits, withdrawals, purchases, and sales.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's submission was insufficient because it did not provide complete six-month transaction information or explain the substantial deposits and withdrawals reflected in the statement.
2. Plaintiff must, within 14 days of service of the order, submit a complete, numbered inmate trust account statement for the six-month period before October 30, 2025, and a declaration under penalty of perjury explaining each deposit, withdrawal, purchase, and sale during that period.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"As submitted, the statement appears to indicate that at some point during the previous six months Plaintiff's account received over \$2,800 in deposits and that Plaintiff withdrew over \$3,000 during that same period, suggesting may have Plaintiff had sufficient funds to pay the full filing fee for this action." (2)

"Within 14 days of the date of service of this order, Plaintiff SHALL also provide a declaration, under penalty of perjury, concerning that same period, and explaining the following:" (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff submitted a purported six-month inmate trust account statement showing a balance of \$0.18, more than \$2,800 in deposits, and more than \$3,000 in withdrawals. The submission did not include transaction-level information, including deposits, payments, purchases, or sales, and appeared to omit portions of the standard statement. Because the information suggested Plaintiff may have had sufficient funds to pay the filing fee, the court required an explanation of the deposits and withdrawals.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court ordered Plaintiff on October 31, 2025, to submit an application to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the filing fee. Plaintiff filed an IFP application on November 18, 2025. After the court ordered an inmate trust account statement, Plaintiff submitted an incomplete one-page document on December 3, 2025. The court found the submission insufficient, directed Plaintiff to resubmit the required materials within 14 days, and warned that noncompliance would result in a recommendation of dismissal for failure to obey court orders and prosecute.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Olivares v. Marshall, 59 F.3d 109, 112 (9th Cir. 1995)

- *Lumbert v. Illinois Department of Corrections*, 827 F.2d 257, 260 (7th Cir. 1987)
- *Owens v. Schultz*, No. 1:24-cv-00820-SKO, 2024 WL 3722881, at *1-2 (E.D. Cal. July 19, 2024)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/richard-woods-v-t-taylor-et-al-wtgbo3w0>