

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

MARCELLA DANIELS, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. ) No. 10 C 1806  
 )  
 FREEDMAN ANSELMO LINDBERG & )  
 RAPPE LLC, et al., )  
 )  
 Defendants. )

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Marcella Daniels ("Daniels") initiated this lawsuit by filing a pro se Complaint against a number of defendants, seeking to invoking the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act and the Fair Credit Reporting Act as the basis for federal jurisdiction. Daniels also filled out and tendered two forms provided by this District Court's Clerk's Office: an In Forma Pauperis Application ("Application") and a Motion for Appointment of Counsel ("Motion"). This Court promptly issued a March 29, 2010 memorandum order that found (1) Daniels had failed to qualify for in forma pauperis treatment so far as nonpayment of the filing fee was concerned and (2) Daniels' Motion was deficient in terms of a failure to provide the information that our Court of Appeals teaches is an essential component of such a request.

Daniels then paid the filing fee and then moved on June 23 to have the United States Marshals Service serve the defendants. This Court denied that motion orally on the date of its presentment, explaining to Daniels the narrow statutory

authorization for service by the Marshals Service.

Now Daniels has submitted a new Motion, listing four lawyers with whom she has spoken about representation and stating:

Some lawyers that I called fees was very high and at this time I'm not working and can't afford it.

For much the same reason that prompted denial of the Application, this Court finds that Daniels has not satisfactorily shown "poverty" (the relevant precondition called for by 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)). Accordingly the Motion is denied. Daniels, who has shown herself to be articulate and has exhibited a full grasp of her claims in her in-court appearances,<sup>1</sup> will continue to proceed pro se.



---

Milton I. Shadur  
Senior United States District Judge

Date: August 17, 2010

---

<sup>1</sup> This Court is not of course expressing its views as to the ultimate merits of Daniels' claims.