

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NO. 06-4836

---

BATSAIHAN PURVEEGIIN,

Appellant

v.

USCA 3RD CIRCUIT COURTS, Corrupt Administratives;  
MARCIA M. WALDRON, USCA 3RD Cir. Court; LYNN LOPEZ,  
USCA 3RD Cir. Legal Aid; BRADFORD BALDUS, USCA 3RD Cir.  
Legal Aid; USCA 3RD CIR. CLERK ADMINISTRATION,  
USCA 3RD Cir. Clerks Office

---

On Appeal From the United States District Court  
For the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
(D.C. Civ. No. 06-04580)  
District Judge: Honorable John P. Fullam

---

Submitted For Possible Dismissal Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)  
April 26, 2007

Before: RENDELL, SMITH AND JORDAN, CIRCUIT JUDGES

(Filed June 13, 2007)

---

OPINION

---

PER CURIAM

Batsaihan Purveegiin, representing himself, sued this Court, or at least its “corrupt

administratives” and “administration,” as well as members of the Court’s staff. His allegations focused on how his pending appeals were being handled. Among other things, he contended that his counsel in another case had seduced, or been seduced by, Court personnel.

The District Court denied Purveegiin’s request to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed Purveegiin’s complaint as legally frivolous. Purveegiin filed a notice of appeal, opening an appeal that proceeds separately. In the District Court, Purveegiin then filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal. The District Court transferred the motion to this Court for disposition. Purveegiin appeals from the order transferring his motion and requests appointment of counsel.

Purveegiin’s appeal is without merit in fact or law. Having already denied Purveegiin’s first motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, the District Court determined that this Court would be the appropriate forum for Purveegiin’s renewed attempt to seek in forma pauperis status. Had the District Court merely denied the motion, Purveegiin would have been permitted to file his motion in this Court. See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(5). The transfer put the motion before us without Purveegiin having to refile it. We do not find error in the District Court’s decision. Accordingly, we will dismiss Purveegiin’s appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and deny his motion for appointment of counsel.