

**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)

OPINION

(PC)Woods

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 RICHARD WOODS, Case No.: 1:25-cv-01449-SKO 12 Plaintiff, ORDER REGARDING
PLAINTIFF'S

FILING OF DECEMBER 3, 2025

13 v.

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO

14 T. TAYLOR, et al., PROVIDE A COMPLETE INMATE TRUST

ACCOUNT STATEMENT AND

15 Defendants. DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF

PERJURY EXPLAINING DEPOSITS AND

16 WITHDRAWALS

17 14-DAY DEADLINE

18 19 Plaintiff Richard Woods is appearing pro se in this civil rights action.

20 I. INTRODUCTION

21 On October 31, 2025, the Court issued its Order to Submit Application to Proceed In 22 Forma
Pauperis or Pay Filing Fee Within 45 Days. (Doc. 3.) On November 18, 2025, Plaintiff 23 filed
Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (IFP) by a Prisoner. (Doc. 5.) 24 On November 20,
2025, the Court issued its Order Directing Plaintiff to Provide an 25 Inmate Trust Account
Statement Within 14 Days. (Doc. 1.) On December 3, 2025, Plaintiff filed 26 an untitled
document, docketed as an Inmate Trust Account Statement, indicating he was 27 providing his "6
Month Trust Account Statement." (Doc. 7.) Attached was a one-page document

1 II. DISCUSSION

2 A review of Plaintiff's December 3, 2025, submission reveals that it is an insufficient 3 response
to the Court's order. Plaintiff was directed to provide an inmate trust account statement 4
"showing transactions for the past six months," [because the Court could not] determine whether
5 a grant of IFP status [was] appropriate despite the 28-cent balance in Plaintiff's account on

6 November 12,” and noted that the Court can consider “deposits and purchases in determining
7 whether an individual should be granted IFP status. *Olivares v. Marshall*, 59 F.3d 109, 112 (9th
8 Cir. 1995)” (Doc. 6 at 2.) However, the recent submission does not include six-month
activity

9 of deposits and/or payments, or information regarding any purchases and/or sales. 10 Instead,
the document provided includes a “Phone Balance” of \$58.16, an “Account 11 Balance” and
“Available Balance” of \$0.18, a “Pre-Release Balance” of \$0.00, other zero 12 balances pertaining
to various encumbrances, instruments and/or holds, a “National 6 Months 13 Deposits” total of
\$2,829.43, a “National 6 Months Withdrawals” total of \$3,077.33, and an 14 “Available Funds to
be considered for IFRP Payments” total of \$2,379.43. (Doc. 7 at 2.) 15 This Court is familiar with
the typical inmate trust account statements available to federal 16 prisoners. Plaintiff’s submission
appears incomplete and does not include the “Commissary 17 History,” “Commissary
Restrictions,” or “Comments” sections of a statement that typically 18 follow the Account
Balances section. The page is also not numbered.¹ As submitted, the 19 statement appears to
indicate that at some point during the previous six months Plaintiff’s account 20 received over
\$2,800 in deposits and that Plaintiff withdrew over \$3,000 during that same period, 21 suggesting
may have Plaintiff had sufficient funds to pay the full filing fee for this action. 22 Without an
explanation² for those deposits and withdrawals, the Court still cannot determine 23 1 Given lack
of page numbers on the page provided, coupled with the dark line along one-half of the right- side
of the page, additional information may have been available on a second page. The printout also
does 24 not include <https://.../truweb/> and report date information typically seen at the very bottom
of a statement. 25 2 *Olivares v. Marshall*, 59 F.3d 109, 112 (9th Cir. 1995) (citation omitted)
(courts are entitled to consider 26 plaintiffs’ “economic choices about how to spend [their]
money” when considering applications to proceed IFP); see also *Lumbert v. Illinois Dep’t of*
Corr., 827 F.2d 257, 260 (7th Cir. 1987) (“If the inmate thinks 27 that a more worthwhile use of
his funds would be to buy peanuts and candy . . . than to file a civil rights suit, he has
demonstrated an implied evaluation of the suit that the district court is entitled to honor”); *Owens*
v. Schultz, No. 1:24-cv-00820-SKO, 2024 WL 3722881, at *1-2 (E.D. Cal. July 19, 2024) 1
whether Plaintiff is entitled to IFP status. 2 Therefore, Plaintiff will be required to resubmit a
complete inmate trust account statement 3 which shall include the statement’s page numbers to
reflect when the entire statement was printed 4 and shall include a declaration under penalty of
perjury regarding the six-month period prior to 5 and including October 30, 2025 (the date his
complaint was filed), that explains each deposit and 6 each withdrawal made during that period.

7 III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER

8 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that: 9 1. Within 14 days of the date of service of
this order, Plaintiff SHALL submit a 10 complete inmate trust account statement, to include
numbered pages, for the six-month 11 period prior to October 30, 2025; and 12 2. Within 14 days
of the date of service of this order, Plaintiff SHALL also provide a 13 declaration, under penalty

of perjury, concerning that same period, and explaining the 14 following: 15 a. All deposits made during the relevant period, including identifying the source 16 of the deposited funds, whether inmate pay or gift, or otherwise; and 17 b. All purchases and/or sale transactions made during the relevant period, 18 identifying the item or items purchased for each transaction. 19 Plaintiff is advised that a failure to comply with this order will result in a 20 recommendation that this action be dismissed for a failure to obey court orders and failure 21 to prosecute. 22 IT IS SO ORDERED. 23 24 Dated: December 4, 2025 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto .

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

25 26 27