

DEC 4 2014

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STEVEN THORESON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ZAHED AHMED, CTF Dr., Individual
Capacity; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 13-17026

D.C. No. 3:13-cv-01943-RS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Richard Seeborg, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 18, 2014**

Before: LEAVY, FISHER, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Steven Thoreson, a California state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court’s order denying his request to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”) in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to his serious medical

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

needs. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion, *James v. Madison St. Jail*, 122 F.3d 27, 27 (9th Cir. 1997) (per curiam), and we affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Thoreson's motion to proceed IFP because Thoreson failed to submit a certified copy of his prisoner trust fund account statements for the previous six months as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2). *See Page v. Torrey*, 201 F.3d 1136, 1139 (9th Cir. 2000) (“[P]risoner-plaintiffs seeking to proceed in forma pauperis [must] submit a certified copy of their prisoner trust fund account statement for the previous six months.”).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Thoreson's postjudgment motion because Thoreson did not identify any new evidence, change in law, clear error, or other basis for reconsideration. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth standard of review and factors for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) and 60(b)).

AFFIRMED.