

On September 3, 2025, Plaintiff filed his response to the court’s order to file copies of the cases he cited (#7). Therein, Plaintiff avers he took “concrete remedial steps” to cure the time wasted by his use of artificial-intelligence-hallucinated case citations, including “submission of the verified opinions as exhibits” (#7 at 2). Indeed, Plaintiff’s response stresses how he “obtained authentic copies” of those cases and “attached” them as exhibits. *See (id.)*.

Plaintiff did not attach any exhibits to his response to this court’s order. The court is convinced that those two case citations are AI-hallucinated. Plaintiff’s insistence that they exist—and that he provided copies of them to this court—is bewildering. Seemingly, Plaintiff is “attempt[ing] to persuade a court . . . by relying on fake opinions,” which “is an abuse of the adversary system.” *Ford v. Bank of N.Y. Mellon*, No. 24-50053, 2025 WL 1008537, at *1 n.1 (5th Cir. Apr. 4, 2025) (quoting *Park v. Kim*, 91 F.4th 610, 615 (2d Cir. 2024)); (#6 at 2).

Because Plaintiff’s objections to Magistrate Judge Stetson’s Report and Recommendation to deny Plaintiff *in forma pauperis* status rely on fake opinions, the court will not consider them. The court therefore reviews Judge Stetson’s recommendation to deny Plaintiff pauper status for clear error. Having done so, the court finds no error.

The recommendation of the magistrate judge (#3) is **ADOPTED**. Plaintiff’s Motion to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis* (#2) is **DENIED**. Within ten (10) days of this order, Plaintiff shall pay the court’s filing fee of \$405 to proceed with this action, or it will be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 10th day of October, 2025.



MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE