

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

MARJORIE A. CREAMER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 11-4110-WEB-KGG
)	
ESIS CLAIMS UNIT,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER ON IFP STATUS

Plaintiff Marjorie Creamer filed a federal court Complaint alleging products liability against a Michigan corporation. (Doc. 1.) In conjunction with her Complaint, Plaintiff also filed a Motion to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees (*IFP* Application, Doc. 3, sealed), with an accompanying Affidavit of Financial Status (Doc. 4, sealed).

This Court analyzed Plaintiff's *IFP* motion and determined that the financial information supplied by Plaintiff was inadequate to allow the Court to make a determination as to whether her monthly expenses exceed her monthly income, how she deals with any potential financial shortfall, and/or whether her expenses are reasonable. (*See* Doc. 5.) Plaintiff was specifically instructed to supplement

her *IFP* submission and provide the Court with the following supplemental financial information:

1. an explanation of her marital/relationship status (including whether some type of domestic partner in her home is employed and contributes to the household financial obligations);
2. an indication of whether she has ever been employed and, if so, the requisite information regarding her former employment;
3. a specific breakdown of her monthly expenses by line item as indicated in the financial affidavit; and
4. a clarification of the amount owed on medical bills (or, at a minimum, an indication of how much she is billed or paying on a monthly basis).

(*Id.*, at 4.)

In accordance with the Court's Order, Plaintiff filed a one page/one paragraph submission on November 7, 2011. (Doc. 6, sealed.) The Court finds that Plaintiff has provided an adequate explanation regarding categories 1 (her marital/relationship status), 2 (her employment status), and 4) her medical bills. (*Id.*) She failed, however, to provide a specific breakdown of her monthly expenses by line item as ordered by the Court. (*See* Doc. 5; *see also* Doc. 6, sealed.)

Despite this oversight, and considering the supplemental information

provided by Plaintiff, the Court finds that Plaintiff has established that she is entitled to file this action without payment of fees and costs because her access to the courts would be limited if she were not granted *IFP* status. Therefore, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and directs that this case be filed without payment of a filing fee.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Application for Leave to File Action Without Payment of Fees, Costs or Security (Doc. 3, sealed) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk's office shall proceed to issue summons in this case.

Dated at Wichita, Kansas, on this 23rd day of November, 2011.

S/ KENNETH G. GALE
KENNETH G. GALE
United States Magistrate Judge