

*Exhibit of  
Evidence  
20-17079-B*

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

JUN 24 2021

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

ALFRED E. CARAFFA,  
Plaintiff - Appellant,  
v.  
CALIFORNIA HOUSING  
SECURITIES, INC., Health Services;  
et al.,  
Defendants - Appellees.

No. 20-17079

D.C. No. 2:20-cv-00256-MTL-ESW  
U.S. District Court for Arizona,  
Phoenix

**ORDER**

A review of the docket demonstrates that appellant has failed to pay the docketing/filing fees in this case.

Pursuant to Ninth Circuit Rule 42-1, this appeal is dismissed for failure to prosecute.

This order served on the district court shall, 21 days after the date of the order, act as the mandate of this court.

Appendix "A"

FOR THE COURT:

MOLLY C. DWYER  
CLERK OF COURT

By: Debra Rhodes  
Deputy Clerk  
Ninth Circuit Rule 27-7

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
6  
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**  
7  
8

9 Alfred E Caraffa,

**NO. CV-20-00256-PHX-MTL (ESW)**

10 Plaintiff,

**JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE**

11 v.

12 CHS, et al.,

13 Defendants.

14  
15 **Decision by Court.** This action came for consideration before the Court. The  
16 issues have been considered and a decision has been rendered.

17 IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that pursuant to the Court's order filed  
18 February 10, 2020, Plaintiff to take nothing, and the complaint and action are dismissed  
19 with prejudice for failure to state a claim. This dismissal may count as a "strike" under  
20 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

21 Debra D. Lucas  
22 Acting District Court Executive/Clerk of Court

23 April 13, 2020

24 By s/ E. Aragon  
25 Deputy Clerk

26

27

28

1

MDR

2

3

4

5

6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

7

8

9 Alfred E. Caraffa,

No. CV 20-00256-PHX-MTL (ESW)

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

**ORDER**

12 CHS, et al.,

13 Defendants.

14

15 On February 3, 2020, Plaintiff Alfred E. Caraffa, who is confined in a Maricopa  
16 County Jail, filed a pro se civil rights Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and an  
17 Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis. In a February 10, 2020 Order, the Court granted  
18 the Application to Proceed, dismissed the Complaint because Plaintiff had failed to state a  
19 claim, and gave Plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint that cured the  
20 deficiencies identified in the Order. The Court warned Plaintiff that the Clerk of Court  
21 would enter a Judgment of dismissal with prejudice if Plaintiff failed to timely file an  
22 amended complaint. Because Plaintiff did not timely file an amended complaint, the Clerk  
23 of Court entered Judgment on April 13, 2020.

24 On September 18, 2020, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint and attached to  
25 it a Motion to Re-Open Civil Action Under New Evidence (Doc. 9 at 21-25). Nothing in  
26 Plaintiff's Motion justifies reopening this action five months after it was closed. Thus, the  
27 Court, in its discretion, will deny Plaintiff's Motion to Re-Open.

28 . . . .

1 **IT IS ORDERED:**

2 (1) Plaintiff's Motion to Re-Open Civil Action Under New Evidence (Doc. 9  
3 at 21-25) is **denied**. This action must remain **closed**.

4 (2) The docket shall reflect that the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3)  
5 and Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(3)(A), has considered whether an appeal  
6 of this decision would be taken in good faith and certifies that an appeal would not be taken  
7 in good faith for the reasons stated in the Order and because there is no arguable factual or  
8 legal basis for an appeal.

9 Dated this 24th day of September, 2020.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Michael T. Liburdi

Michael T. Liburdi  
United States District Judge

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**