

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
ANDREW COLLETTE,

Plaintiff,

v.

JON LITSCHER,  
MICHAEL CATALANO,  
PRISON HEALTH SERVICES, INC.,  
PAM BARTELS,  
JOHN DOES 1, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 82, 84, A, D and E;  
and GERALD A. BERGE,

Defendant.  
-----

ORDER

04-C-164-C

Cole v. Litscher, 04-C-116-C, is a lawsuit that was transferred to this district from the District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin. When it was transferred, there were 14 plaintiffs, all prisoners or former prisoners in the Wisconsin prison system. In an order dated March 15, 2004, I severed the claims of the several plaintiffs, including those of plaintiff Andrew Collette. In an effort to insure that each individual pro se plaintiff was aware of the claims that had been raised on his behalf, I instructed the plaintiffs to submit, no later than April 9, 2004, individual proposed pleadings setting forth only those claims on

which they had been allowed to proceed and identifying all defendants who allegedly committed the acts about which they complained. I advised the plaintiffs that when I received their amend pleadings, I would review them to insure they were limited to the claims on which each had been granted leave to proceed. I advised the plaintiffs that if they were still unable to identify the defendants they described as Doe defendants almost two years ago when the original complaint was filed, I would dismiss the claims for which no defendant had been identified.

On April 13, 2004, plaintiff Collette submitted a letter to this court. In the letter, Collette indicates that he is identifying the John Does he has been instructed to name. The letter contains no allegations of fact forming the basis for the claims on which plaintiff Collette was granted leave to proceed. Moreover, all of the Does that plaintiff identifies have been dismissed from the case. When the case was transferred to this district, only Does 1, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 82, 84, A, D and E remained.

As I noted in the March 15, 2004 order, this case has been pending nearly two years. There has been more than ample time for plaintiff to have conducted discovery to learn the name of the Doe defendants listed by the Eastern District court in relation to each of the claims on which plaintiff was allowed to proceed. Plaintiff's failure to make a diligent effort to learn who the Doe defendants are so that they could be served with plaintiff's complaint is a sufficient ground alone for dismissing plaintiff's claims against the Doe defendants.

The March 15 order made it clear to plaintiff that he would need to submit no later than April 9, 2004, an amended pleading setting out his claims against the defendants. As noted above, this requirement was imposed to insure that he understood and consented to the claims that were raised on his behalf in the group complaint. Plaintiff's failure to submit such a pleading suggests that he has not been involved in any meaningful way with litigating the group complaint and that he is not prepared to prosecute his own claims in a severed lawsuit.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED without prejudice to plaintiff Andrew Collette filing a new complaint at some future time.

Entered this 19th day of April, 2004.

BY THE COURT:

BARBARA B. CRABB  
District Judge