

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Teddy Richards v. Tesla Inc.

Richards · No. 25-cv-06013-WHO · Decided October 16, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California dismissed Teddy Richards’s case against Tesla Inc. without prejudice. The court dismissed the case for failure to pay the filing fee, failure to submit a complete and sufficient in forma pauperis application, and failure to comply with court orders.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William H. Orrick
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	October 16, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-06013-WHO
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court dismissed the case without prejudice after the plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee, submit a complete and sufficient application to proceed in forma pauperis, and comply with court orders.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Teddy Richards v. Tesla Inc.

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the case should be dismissed without prejudice because the plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee, failed to submit a complete and sufficient in forma pauperis application, and failed to comply with court orders.

HOLDINGS

1. A case may be dismissed without prejudice when the plaintiff fails to pay the required filing fee, fails to submit a complete and sufficient application to proceed in forma pauperis, and fails to comply with the court's orders.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Therefore, this case is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to pay the filing fee, failure to submit a complete and sufficient application to proceed in forma pauperis, and failure to comply with the orders of this Court.” (at 18-22)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Richards repeatedly failed to provide complete and sufficient information to proceed in forma pauperis. After the court ordered him to pay the required filing fee within 30 days, he neither paid the fee nor submitted a complete and sufficient IFP application.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court adopted Judge Joseph C. Spero's Report and Recommendation on September 9, 2025, and ordered Richards to pay the filing fee within 30 days after finding that he had not provided complete and sufficient information to proceed in forma pauperis. Richards neither paid the filing fee nor submitted a complete and sufficient IFP application, so the court dismissed the case without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Mederer v. Access Cap. Inv. Fund Two, LP, No. 21-cv-9699-YGR, 2022 WL 2289056, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2022)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7
TEDDY RICHARDS, Case No. 25-cv-06013-WHO 8 Plaintiff, ORDER DISMISSING CASE
FOR 9 Vv. FAILURE TO PAY FILING FEE 10 TESLA INC., 11 Defendant. 12 On September 9,
2025, I ADOPTED the Report and Recommendation of Judge Joseph C. 13 || Spero. Dkt. No. 13. I
found that despite repeated orders, plaintiff Teddy Richards had not 14 || provided complete and
sufficient information to be allowed to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”).

15 || Therefore, I ordered plaintiff Richards to pay the required filing within 30 days. a 16 As of the date of this Order, Richards still has not paid the filing fee or submitted a 3 17 || complete and sufficient IFP application. 18 Therefore, this case is DISMISSED without prejudice for failure to pay the filing fee, 19 || failure to submit a complete and sufficient application to proceed in forma pauperis, and failure to 20 || comply with the orders of this Court.

See *Mederer v. Access Cap. Inv. Fund Two, LP*, No. 21-cv- 21 9699-YGR, 2022 WL 2289056, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2022) (dismissing a case for failure to 22 || pay the filing fee). 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 Dated: October 16, 2025 26. liam H. Orrick 27 United States District Judge 28