If you view the you will be charged for 1 Pages \$0.08

General Docket Third Circuit Court of Appeals

Court of Appeals Docket #: 93-1780 Docketed: 08/12/ Nature of Suit: 3550 Prisoner-Civil Rights Termed: 07/25/ Rauso v. Cohen Appeal From: U.S. District Court for the District of Eastern Pennsylvania Fee Status: IFP Fee Status: IFP			
Case Type In 1) prisoner 2) State 3) Civil Rig			
District: 0 District Ju Date Filed	···· J · · ·	• NOA Filed: /1993	
11/29/1993	MOTION filed by Appellant to reopen appeal. No Service.		
11/29/1993	MOTION filed by Appellant to amend jurisdictional defect answer. No		
03/18/1994	STAFF ATTORNEY LETTER SENT to Appellant advising upon further examination of Affidavit in support of Motion to proceed in forma pauperis, they have noted that several answers need further clarification; Directing him to refer to 2(a) where he stated he received \$4,000.00 in rents; this answer does not describe each source and the amount received from each during the past 12 months. In addition, the response to 4(a) is equally deficient; Appellant is directed to describe the valuable property and its approximate value. He also stated that he has no equity in this property and referred to a bankruptcy case, they note that there was no attachment of the case. Appellant is requested to provide any pertinent information regarding the bankruptcy action. Appellant's response to this letter is necessary for this Court's adjudication of his motion to proceed in forma pauperis.		
03/30/1994	RESPONSE to Staff Attorney's letter of 3/18/94 by Appellant Gennard Rauso, received. Certificate of Service dated 3/29/94.		
05/19/1994	ubmitted on motion to reopen appeal ., affidavit to proceed in forma pauperis . Coram: Becker, Nygaard, Roth, rcuit Judges.		
07/25/1994	appeal and to proceed in forma pauperis. We are satisfied that we had dismissed as it is without arguable legal and/or factual merit under 28 Hernandez, 112 S. Ct. 1728 (1992); Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 31	Authoring Judge, Nygaard, Roth, Circuit Judges) granting motions by appellant pro se to reopen ceed in forma pauperis. We are satisfied that we have appellate jurisdiction. The appeal is without arguable legal and/or factual merit under 28 U.S.C. section 1915(d). See Denton v. . Ct. 1728 (1992); Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989). That is because Judge Cohen is im for damages by reason of the doctrine of judicial immunity because the acts complained of her judicial capacity, filed.	
07/25/1994	Certified copy of Order sent to Clerk of District Court.		
07/25/1994	RECORD RETURNED.		
08/15/1994	IOTION filed by Appellant Gennaro Rauso to recall mandate., to extend time to file petition for rehearing en banc /22/94 Certificate of Service dated 8/10/94.		
08/17/1994	ORDER (Becker, Circuit Judge) denying motion to recall mandate by extend time to file petition for rehearing en banc by Appellant Genna		

PACER Service Center

Transaction Receipt					
04/14/2011 10:30:40					
PACER Login:	cc0489	Client Code:			
Description:	Case Summary	Search Criteria:	93-1780		
Billable Pages:	1	Cost:	0.08		