

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 1 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CHIDDY GOLDEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

AMAZON.COM SERVICES, LLC, a
business entity, form unknown;
AMERICAN ARBITRATION
ASSOCIATION INC, American Arbitration
Association, Inc.; DOES 1-10,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 26-1655

D.C. No. 2:25-cv-12354-ODW-
MAA

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Otis D. Wright, II, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 25, 2026**

Before: SILVERMAN, N.R. SMITH, and DE ALBA, Circuit Judges.

The motion (Docket Entry No. 8) to proceed in forma pauperis is granted.

Chiddy Golden appeals pro se from the district court's order dismissing for

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

failure to pay the filing fee his action alleging federal and state law claims after denying Golden's request for in forma pauperis ("IFP") status. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Taylor v. Delatoore*, 281 F.3d 844, 847 (9th Cir. 2002). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing Golden's action without prejudice after denying Golden's IFP application because Golden failed to make a sufficient showing of indigency and failed to pay the filing fee. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) (explaining that a person seeking IFP status must "submit[] an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such [person] possesses [and] that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor"); *Escobedo v. Applebees*, 787 F.3d 1226, 1234 (9th Cir. 2015) ("[A] plaintiff seeking IFP status must allege poverty with some particularity, definiteness and certainty." (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Golden's motions for reconsideration because Golden failed to establish a basis for relief. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262-63 (9th Cir. 1993) (setting forth standard of review and grounds for reconsideration).

The motion (Docket Entry Nos. 9 and 10) to file documents under seal is granted. The motion (Docket Entry No. 4) for judicial notice is denied as

unnecessary. All other pending requests are denied.

AFFIRMED.