

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

McCARTHY S. LARNGAR,

Petitioner,

v.

ASHBEL T. WALL,

Respondent

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

C.A. No. 17-300 WES

ORDER

WILLIAM E. SMITH, Chief Judge.

Magistrate Judge Lincoln D. Almond filed a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") (ECF No. 19) in this case, recommending the Court deny Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Appeal in Forma Pauperis ("Plaintiff's Motion") (ECF No. 17).

After careful review of the papers attending Plaintiff's Motion, and of the R&R, and having heard no objection, the Court ACCEPTS the R&R and adopts its recommendation and reasoning. Plaintiff's Motion (ECF No. 17) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



William E. Smith

Chief Judge

Date: July 20, 2018

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

McCARTHY LARNGAR

v.

ASHBEL T. WALL

:
:
:
:
:

C.A. No. 17-00300-WES

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Lincoln D. Almond, United States Magistrate Judge

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Appeal In Forma Pauperis ("IFP"). (ECF Doc. No. 17). 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, Plaintiff's Motion for Certificate of Appealability was denied by Chief Judge Smith because Plaintiff "failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right as to any claim, as required by 28 U.S.C. 2253(c)(2)." (ECF Doc. No. 15 at p. 9). Plaintiff has still failed to make such a showing. Because the Court has determined that Plaintiff is not

entitled to appeal at all, he is not entitled to appeal IFP, and I recommend his Motion be DENIED.
(ECF Doc. No. 17).

Any objection to this Report and Recommendation must be specific and must be filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen 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 (1st Cir. 1986); Park Motor Mart, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., 616 F.2d 603, 605 (1st Cir. 1980).

/s/ Lincoln D. Almond
LINCOLN D. ALMOND
United States Magistrate Judge
May 10, 2018