

FILED

Date:

2026.01.2

8 12:28:27

Office of
Appellate Courts

06'00'

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN SUPREME COURT

A25-1449

Charise L. Logan,

Petitioner,

vs.

First Transit,

Respondent.

ORDER

Based upon all the files, records, and proceedings herein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion of Charise L. Logan for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition of Charise L. Logan for further review is denied.

Dated: January 28, 2026

BY THE COURT:

Natalie E. Hudson

Natalie E. Hudson
Chief Justice

Appendix A

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS

Charise L. Logan,

Appellant,

vs.

First Transit,

Respondent.

ORDER

FILED

Date:
2025.11.0

A25-1449

OFFICE OF
APPELLATE COURTS

4 14:45:59
-06'00'

BASED ON THE FILE, RECORD, AND PROCEEDINGS, AND BECAUSE:

1. This appeal was filed on August 28, 2025.
2. In a September 4, 2025 notice of case filing, the clerk of the appellate courts directed appellant Charise Logan to either pay the \$550 filing fee or file a copy of a district court order waiving the filing fee on appeal. The clerk of the appellate courts also directed appellant to file (1) proof of filing a copy of the notice of appeal with the district court administrator and (2) proof of service of the notice of appeal and statement of the case on counsel for respondent First Transit.
3. In a September 5, 2025 order, we directed appellant to remedy the filing deficiencies identified in the notice of case filing by September 15, 2025.
4. In a September 19, 2025 order, we directed appellant to remedy the filing deficiencies identified in the notice of case filing by September 29, 2025.

Appendix B

5. Appellant submitted a copy of an application requesting waiver of the filing fee on appeal on September 11, 2025. But the register of actions does not indicate that appellant filed the application in district court. *See* Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 109.02 (requiring a party who wishes to proceed in forma pauperis and waive the filing fee on appeal to file a motion in district court requesting waiver of the appellate filing fee). On September 24, 2025, appellant submitted an affidavit of service stating that "23 documents" were served on counsel for respondent. The clerk of the appellate courts rejected the affidavit on September 29, 2025, because it did not identify the documents served.

6. In an October 3, 2025 order, we afforded appellant a final opportunity to remedy the filing deficiencies identified in the notice of case filing and our September 5, 2025 and September 19, 2025 orders. We warned that appellant's failure to comply with our October 3, 2025 order could result in the dismissal of this appeal without further notice.

7. On October 13, 2025, appellant submitted 35 pages of "exhibits." The clerk of the appellate courts rejected the documents as unauthorized and noted that the documents did not remedy the deficiencies identified by our October 3, 2025 order.

8. Our records do not reflect that appellant has remedied the deficiencies identified in the notice of case filing and our September 5, 2025, September 19, 2025, and October 3, 2025 orders. We therefore dismiss this appeal pursuant to our October 3, 2025 order.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. This appeal is dismissed.

2. The clerk of the appellate courts shall provide copies of this order to the Honorable Rachna Sullivan, the self-represented appellant, counsel for respondent, and the district court administrator.

Dated: November 4, 2025

BY THE COURT

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Frisch', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Jennifer L. Frisch
Chief Judge

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