

Wolff v. Arugay, 6 ROP Intrm. 191 (1997)
MARTIN WOLFF, et al.,
Appellants,

v.

JANE ARUGAY, et al.,
Appellees.

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 9-97
Civil Action No. 109-94

Supreme Court, Appellate Division
Republic of Palau

Order denying motion to proceed in forma pauperis
Decided: July 8, 1997

MILLER, Justice:

Appellant Martin Wolff moves this Court to permit him to proceed *in forma pauperis*, after the trial court denied an identical motion on May 6, 1997. Pursuant to Rule 24(c) of the Rules of Appellate Procedure, “[a] motion for leave . . . to proceed [*in forma pauperis*] may be filed in the Appellate Division within ten (10) days after [service of the trial court’s denial of the motion].” Appellant filed his motion 28 days after the trial court’s order was served. Therefore, his motion is untimely.

In any event, we find that appellant’s motion is without merit. Appellant has already paid the filing fee for his appeal. As pointed out by the trial court, to the extent that **L192** the appellant is requesting the Judiciary to pay for the cost of transcribing the proceedings below, the issue is settled. The Judiciary does not have the resources to pay transcription costs in civil appeals. *Emaudiong v. Arbedul*, 4 ROP Intrm. 200 (1994).

Accordingly, the motion is DENIED.