

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

TYRONE HILL,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action No. 2:12-132
	)	
v.	)	
	)	Magistrate Judge Cynthia Reed Eddy
UNITED STATES,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

On February 6, 2012, Plaintiff in the above-captioned case submitted a complaint in the United States Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania and moved to proceed *in forma pauperis*. On May 7, 2011, this Court granted Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in the current action (ECF No. 9). Subsequently, this Court discovered that Plaintiff has had at least three prior actions dismissed on the grounds that they were frivolous or failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Consequently, this Court is required to review the Plaintiff's action under the directive in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), that was passed as part of the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996).

In this regard, in the PLRA, Congress adopted a new section known as the "three strikes rule," codified at 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), which provides as follows.

In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) (as amended).

Under the three strikes rule, a prisoner who, on three or more prior occasions while incarcerated, has filed an action in a federal court that was dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, must be denied IFP status unless he is in imminent danger of serious physical injury. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).<sup>1</sup> Court records indicate that Plaintiff has had three prior strikes.

Specifically, in Hill v. Sanders, Civil Action No. 2:07-0013 (E.D. Ark.), on March 29, 2007, Plaintiff's action was dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. In Hill v. Sanders, et al., Civil Action No. 2:06-0230 (E.D. Ark.), on April 23, 2007, Plaintiff's action was dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. In Hill v. Holinka, Civil Action No. 0:06-4720 (D. Minn.), on February 27, 2008, Plaintiff's action was dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted for his failure to have exhausted his administrative remedies.

Although Plaintiff has had at least three previous "strikes," he may be entitled to proceed IFP under the "imminent danger" exception to the three strikes rule. To satisfy the imminent danger element, Plaintiff must allege facts showing that he was in imminent danger at the time the complaint was filed; allegations that the prisoner has faced imminent danger in the past are insufficient to trigger the exception to section 1915(g). See Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie, 239 F.3d 307 (3d Cir. 2001) (overruling Gibbs v. Roman, 116 F.3d 83, 86 (3d Cir. 1997)). In making this

---

1. The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has held that dismissals based on "frivolousness" that occurred prior to the passage of the PLRA are to be included among the three strikes under section 1915(g). See Keener v. Pennsylvania Bd. of Probation and Parole, 128 F.3d 143, 144-45 (3d Cir. 1997).

determination, the court should construe all allegations in a complaint in favor of the plaintiff. Gibbs v. Cross, 160 F.3d 962, 965 (3d Cir. 1998); Gibbs v. Roman, 116 F.3d at 86. The Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has instructed that:

"[i]mmminent" dangers are those dangers which are about to occur at any moment or are impending. By using the term "imminent," Congress indicated that it wanted to include a safety valve for the "three strikes" rule to prevent impending harms, not those harms that had already occurred. The imminent danger exception allows the district court to permit an otherwise barred prisoner to file a complaint I.F.P. if the prisoner could be subject to serious physical injury and does not then have the requisite filing fee.

Abdul-Akbar, 239 F.3d at 315 (internal citation omitted).

A review of Plaintiff's allegations fails to indicate any imminent danger of physical injury caused by Defendant's alleged misconduct when the action was filed. Rather, Plaintiff's Complaint is complaining about an alleged sexual assault that supposedly occurred on May 10, 2010.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed IFP should not have been granted under the three strikes rule in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).<sup>3</sup> As such, the following Order is entered.

**AND NOW**, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2012:

1. This Court's Order granting Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* is **VACATED**.
2. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* is **DENIED**.
2. The Clerk of Court is directed to mark this case **CLOSED with the right of Plaintiff to reopen by paying the full \$350.00 filing fee within 60 days**.

---

<sup>2</sup> This Court notes that Plaintiff has filed at least two other complaints in other federal courts wherein he makes substantially similar claims of sexual assault.

<sup>3</sup> It is noted by the Court that the docket entries in this action do not show that any filing fees have been received for this action.

4. The Clerk of Court is directed to forward a copy of this Order to the Warden of the Federal Medical Center (FMC) at Devens, MA.

/s/ Cynthia Reed Eddy  
Cynthia Reed Eddy  
United States Magistrate Judge

Inmate Accounting Office  
FMC DEVENS  
Federal Medical Center  
P.O. BOX 880  
Ayer, MA 01432

Tyrone Hill  
71015-004  
FMC DEVENS  
Federal Medical Center  
P.O. BOX 879 Unit N-1  
Ayer, MA 01432