

*Adkins v. E.I. Dupont de Nemours*, 335 U.S. 331, 339-40 (1948); *Martinez v. Kristi Kleaners, Inc.*, 364 F.3d 1305, 1307 (11th Cir. 2007). While a plaintiff need not be absolutely destitute in order to proceed IFP, the fact that financing his own litigation may cause some difficulty is not sufficient to relieve a plaintiff of his obligation to pay his own way where it is possible for him to do so without undue hardship. *Adkins*, 335 U.S. at 339-40.

Sutherland, who is not an inmate, said in his CV415-188 case that he receives \$1,200.07 per month in retirement income and had \$500 in a checking account, but paid \$1,180 in monthly expenses. CV415-188 doc. 2 at 2. Basically re-running his CV415-188 case here, his IFP filing shows just \$200 in savings but essentially the same financial profile. CV415-275, doc. 2. Again, he is not utterly without means. And especially in light of his litigation history, he can and should put some of his own skin in the game, rather rely exclusively on the public to fund his latest round of litigation. The Court thus conditions its IFP grant on Sutherland's payment of \$150 toward the \$400 statutory filing fee. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). His motion to proceed IFP therefore is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part. Doc. 2. Sutherland must submit the \$150 filing fee within 10 days of service of this Order or face dismissal of his case.