

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

RODOSVALDO POZO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

CINDY SAWINSKI, DR. COX,  
THOMAS BOSTON and R. SCHNEITER,

06-C-206-S

Defendants.

---

On August 28, 2006 judgment was entered in the above entitled matter in favor of defendants against plaintiff dismissing his complaint and all claims contained therein with prejudice and costs. On September 6, 2006 the Court denied plaintiff's motion to alter or amend judgment. On September 19, 2006 plaintiff filed a notice of appeal and a request to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal.

      In Newlin v. Helman, 123 F.3d 429, 433 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) the United States Court of Appeals discussed the determination of whether an appeal is taken in bad faith as follows:

Frivolousness is an objective inquiry; "good faith" implies a subjective standard. But judges lack access to the plaintiff's mental processes. Thoughts must be inferred from acts. A plaintiff who has been told that the claim is foreclosed and then files a notice of appeal without offering any argument to undermine the district court's conclusion is acting in bad faith.

On August 26, 2006 plaintiff was advised that in any future proceedings he must offer argument not cumulative of that already provided to undermine this Court's conclusion that his claims must be dismissed. Plaintiff has not provided such argument. Accordingly, plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is not taken in good faith and will be denied.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is DENIED.

Entered this 25th day of September, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

S/

---

JOHN C. SHABAZ  
District Judge