

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

NORMAN LAURENCE, JR. :  
 :  
 v. : C.A. No. 07-81ML  
 :  
 ASHBEL T. WALL, et. al. :

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Lincoln D. Almond, United States Magistrate Judge

Pending before the Court for a report and recommendation (28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); LR Cv 72) is Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis (“IFP”). (Document No. 49). Because I find that the appeal is groundless and thus not taken in good faith, I recommend that the District Court DENY Plaintiff’s Motion.

Plaintiff’s right to appeal *in forma pauperis* is governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1915 which provides that, “[a]n appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). “Because the good faith standard is an objective one, an appeal is deemed not taken in good faith if the issues presented are frivolous. An appeal is considered frivolous when it is based on an ‘indisputably meritless legal theory or factual allegations that are clearly baseless.’” Lyons v. Wall, No. 04-380, 2007 WL 2067661 at \*1 (D.R.I. July 13, 2007) (internal citations omitted).

In the present case, the District Court dismissed Plaintiff’s Complaint noting that this Court’s Report and Recommendation “accurately describes the deficiencies in Plaintiff’s Complaint.” Document No. 47 at 1. The Report and Recommendation noted that Plaintiff had filed five similar lawsuits dating back to 2006, and that a 2008 Complaint was extensively litigated in this Court and

is presently pending before the Court of Appeals. Document No. 45 at 2-3. The subject matter of all of the lawsuits is Plaintiff's belief that Defendants, largely agents or employees of the Adult Correctional Institution, are surveilling him. This Court concluded that "Plaintiff's Complaint presents an unsupported, irrational and paranoid tale...[and] allowing this case to proceed would essentially give Plaintiff an unwarranted 'second bite at the apple' as to these frivolous claims." Id. at 6. Therefore, Plaintiff's proposed appeal to the First Circuit Court of Appeals presents no cognizable legal theories or meritorious factual allegations. Accordingly, I recommend that the District Court find that the appeal is not taken in good faith and DENY Plaintiff's Motion to Appeal IFP (Document No. 49).

Any objection to this Report and Recommendation must be specific and must be filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days of its receipt. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); LR Cv 72. Failure to file specific objections in a timely manner constitutes waiver of the right to review by the District Court and the right to appeal the District Court's decision. See United States v. Valencia-Copete, 792 F.2d 4, 6 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1986); Park Motor Mart, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., 616 F.2d 603, 605 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1980).

/s/ Lincoln D. Almond  
LINCOLN D. ALMOND  
United States Magistrate Judge  
June 30, 2011