

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 13-1041

September Term, 2012

Filed On: May 31, 2013

In re: David Alan Schum,

Petitioner

BEFORE: Henderson, Griffith, and Kavanaugh, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, the motion for leave to seal the in forma pauperis motion and supporting affidavit, and the petition for writ of mandamus, it is

ORDERED that the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis be granted. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for leave to seal the in forma pauperis motion and affidavit be denied. Petitioner has shown no basis to warrant sealing these judicial records, which are standard forms that he submitted to the court because he wished to obtain the privilege of commencing his action without prepayment of the filing fee, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). See Johnson v. Greater Southeast Comty. Hosp. Corp., 951 F.2d 1268, 1277 (D.C. Cir. 1991) (emphasizing the “strong presumption in favor of public access to judicial proceedings”); see also Sturdza v. United Arab Emirates, No. 07-7034 (D.C. Cir. Oct. 23, 2007) (denying motion for leave to file ex parte a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis); Wolfe v. Graham, No. 95-7137 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 22, 1995) (denying motion to seal motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the petition be denied. Petitioner has not shown that he has a “clear and indisputable” right to mandamus relief. Gulfstream Aerospace Corp. v. Mayacamas Corp., 485 U.S. 271, 289 (1988).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published.

Per Curiam