

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

-----  
CHRISTOPHER M. SANDERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

MS. LACOST, MS. NICHOLAI,  
JEFF PUGH, MS. WALLACE,  
ALFONSO GRAHAM, DEB DUELL,  
MS. LUNDMARK, MS. BURNS and  
MS. RICHARDSON,

Defendants.  
-----

ORDER

11-cv-311-slc<sup>1</sup>

On May 26, 2011, I denied plaintiff Christopher Sanders leave to proceed on his claims that prison officials violated his constitutional rights by denying him parole unlawfully, administering an unfair grievance system, retaliating against him and denying him the right to equal protection under the law. Now plaintiff has filed a notice of appeal, a request to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal and a motion for appointment of counsel on appeal.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of issuing this order, I am assuming jurisdiction over the case.

A district court has authority to deny a request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 for one or more of the following reasons: the litigant wishing to take an appeal has not established indigence, the appeal is taken in bad faith or the litigant is a prisoner and has three strikes. § 1915(a)(1),(3) and (g). Sperow v. Melvin, 153 F.3d 780, 781 (7th Cir. 1998). Plaintiff's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal will be denied, because I am certifying that his appeal is not taken in good faith.

In Lucien v. Roegner, 682 F.2d 625, 626 (7th Cir. 1982), the court of appeals instructed district courts to find bad faith in cases in which a plaintiff is appealing the same claims the court found to be without legal merit. Lee v. Clinton, 209 F.3d 1025, 1027 (7th Cir. 2000). Plaintiff is trying to appeal the same claims on which I denied him leave to proceed. Because there is no legally meritorious basis for plaintiff's appeal, I must certify that the appeal is not taken in good faith.

Because I am certifying plaintiff's appeal as not having been taken in good faith, he cannot proceed with his appeal without prepaying the \$455 filing fee unless the court of appeals gives him permission to do so. Under Fed. R. App. P. 24, plaintiff has 30 days from the date of this order in which to ask the court of appeals to review this court's denial of leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. With his motion, he must include an affidavit as described in the first paragraph of Fed. R. App. P. 24(a), with a statement of issues he intends to argue on appeal. Also, he must send along a copy of this order. Plaintiff should

be aware that he must file these documents in addition to the notice of appeal he has filed previously.

If plaintiff does not file a motion requesting review of this order, the court of appeals might not address the denial of leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. Instead, it may require plaintiff to pay the entire \$455 filing fee before it considers his appeal. If plaintiff does not pay the fee within the deadline set, it is possible that the court of appeals will dismiss the appeal and order the court to arrange for collection of the fee from plaintiff's prison account.

Finally, plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel on appeal is not properly raised in this court. If he wishes to be appointed counsel on appeal, he will have to make his request directly to the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

## ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Plaintiff Christopher Sanders's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal, dkt. #9, is DENIED. I certify that his appeal is not taken in good faith. The clerk of court is directed to insure that plaintiff's obligation to pay the \$455 fee for filing his appeal is reflected in the court's financial records.

2. Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel on appeal, dkt. #7, is DENIED

without prejudice to his refiling it with the Court of Appeals.

Entered this 5th day of July, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge