

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

DIONTA REMARO CHEVELLE HAYWOOD,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARATHON COUNTY SHERIFF
and RICKY BELL,

Defendants.

ORDER

07-C-341-C

In an order dated August 3, 2007, I granted plaintiff Dionta Remaro Chevelle Haywood leave to proceed in forma pauperis on his claim that defendant Ricky Bell used excessive force against him at the Marathon County Jail on April 20, 2005. In addition, I allowed him to proceed against the Marathon County sheriff on his claim that an unknown correctional officer slammed his head to the floor after he had ceased resisting. Finally, I stayed a decision whether to grant plaintiff leave to proceed with respect to his claims that an unnamed individual or individuals failed to provide him with adequate medical care after the altercation on April 20, 2005. I gave plaintiff until August 17, 2007, in which to file an addendum to his complaint that would include allegations describing

(1) who failed to provide plaintiff with medical care;

(2) what injury he sustained when his head was pushed to the floor;

(3) what, if anything, he told the individuals or the individuals could see for themselves about his injury;

(4) when he was taken to the hospital for the HIV/AIDS test; and

(5) whether he was prevented from asking for medical attention at the hospital.

I told plaintiff that if, by August 17, 2007, he did not file an addendum with the court, I would assume that he did not wish to proceed with his claim of deliberate indifference to his medical needs against unnamed respondents and I would dismiss that claim.

A copy of this court's August 3, 2007 order was mailed to plaintiff at the address he provided when he filed his complaint, the Marathon County Jail, 500 Forest St., Wausau, Wisconsin, 54403. Now, however, the order has been returned to this court in its envelope, which has been marked, "Return to Sender, No longer at this address."

A litigant in this court has the obligation to keep the court advised of his or her current address so that the court can communicate with the litigant. Plaintiff's failure to keep the court advised of his current whereabouts makes it impossible for the court to move this case to resolution. Indeed, it suggests only that plaintiff is no longer interested in prosecuting his case. Therefore, I will dismiss the action without prejudice to plaintiff's refiling his complaint at some later time when he is prepared to pursue it diligently. Because the court does not have a current address for plaintiff, the copy of this order intended for

plaintiff will be placed in the court's file.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that this case is DISMISSED without prejudice on the court's own motion for plaintiff's failure to prosecute.

Entered this 24th day of August, 2007.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge