

Appendix A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

June 18, 2024

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-1245	MARTIN AKERMAN, Plaintiff - Appellant v. NORTHWESTERN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant - Appellee
Originating Case Information:	
District Court No: 2:24-cv-00152-BHL Eastern District of Wisconsin District Judge Brett H. Ludwig	

Upon consideration of the **MOTION TO WAIVE APPEAL FEE**, filed on March 24, 2024, by the pro se appellant,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for leave to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis is **DENIED**. The appellant has not made a potentially meritorious argument that the district court erred in denying his motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Appellant shall pay the required docketing fee within 14 days, or else this appeal will be dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant to Circuit Rule 3(b).

Appendix B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

MARTIN AKERMAN,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-cv-0152-bhl

v.

NORTHWESTERN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS

On February 5, 2024, Martin Akerman, proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint against Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company (Northwestern Mutual) alleging breach of his life insurance policy. (ECF No. 1.) That same day, he also filed a motion for leave to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee or *in forma pauperis* (IFP). (ECF No. 2.) The Court screened the complaint on February 9, 2024, and concluded Akerman was not indigent based on the sworn statement of assets he signed and filed along with his request. (ECF No. 4.) Accordingly, the Court ordered him to pay the full \$405 civil filing fee within 21 days. (*Id.*) Akerman responded by first filing a letter with the Clerk of Court requesting, among other things, reconsideration of his IFP request. (ECF No. 5.) He then filed a notice of appeal of the IFP denial on February 16, 2024. (ECF No. 7.) On February 21, 2024, Akerman filed another letter with the Clerk, this time attaching a document purporting to be a motion for leave to proceed IFP in an unrelated case in front of the United States Supreme Court and showing that he has been granted IFP status in several other state and federal courts. (ECF Nos. 11 & 11-1.) Then, on March 4, 2024, Akerman filed a motion for leave to appeal IFP. (ECF No. 12.)

The Court may allow a litigant to appeal IFP if the litigant establishes his indigency and his appeal is taken in good faith. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), a litigant may not appeal IFP if the district court “certifies in writing that [the appeal] is not taken in good faith.” “[T]o determine that an appeal is in good faith, a court need only find that a reasonable person could suppose that the appeal has some merit.” *Walker v. O’Brien*, 216 F.3d 626, 632 (7th Cir. 2000).

has not provided any convincing evidence to the contrary. Accordingly, the Court will certify that his appeal is not taken in good faith.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Akerman's motion for leave to appeal without prepayment of the filing fee, ECF No. 12, is **DENIED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin on March 7, 2024.

s/ Brett H. Ludwig

BRETT H. LUDWIG

United States District Judge

Appendix C

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

June 25, 2024

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-1245	MARTIN AKERMAN, Plaintiff - Appellant
	v.
	NORTHWESTERN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant - Appellee
Originating Case Information:	
District Court No: 2:24-cv-00152-BHL Eastern District of Wisconsin District Judge Brett H. Ludwig	

Upon consideration of the **PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION**, filed on
June 18, 2024, by the pro se appellant,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.