

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

CHARLES PRIDE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

10-cv-506-bbc

CITY OF EAGLE RIVER, WISCONSIN;
JEFF HYSLOP, Mayor; EAGLE RIVER ZONING,
FRED INTERMUEHLE; JOE LAUX, Eagle River
Zoning Administrator; JERRY BURKET, Alderman;
GEORGE MEADOWS, Alderman;
KIM SCHAFFER, Alderman;
CAROL HENDRICK, Alderman;
DEB BROWN, Eagle River City Clerk;
EAGLE RIVER LIGHT AND WATER;
LON BUSHI, Eagle River Light and Water Director;
PAT WEBER, Eagle River Light and Water Manager;
and other employees to be specified;
EAGLE RIVER PUBLIC WORKS;
JOE TOMLANOVICH, Eagle River Public
Works Director; MIKE ADAMOVICH, Eagle River
Public Works Manager; and other employees to be specified;
MIDSTATE ENGINEERING; SCOT MARTIN, Midstate
Engineering Engineer; EAGLE RIVER PLANNING
COMMISSION, various members to be specified;
BLACKHAWK ENGINEERING; GREG HUZA;
O'BRIEN, ANDERSON, BURG & GARBOWICZ;
and STEVE GARBOWICZ, Eagle River City Attorney.

Defendants.

- - - - -

On September 23, 2010, I dismissed plaintiff Charles Pride's complaint for failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 and 20. In his complaint, he alleged violations of his constitutional rights by more than 20 defendants associated with the City of Eagle River, Wisconsin. His complaint contained numerous allegations spanning a 30-year period and failed to identify specifically how each named defendant was personally involved in the alleged violations of plaintiff's rights. I told plaintiff that he could file an amended complaint that complied with Rules 8 and 20 by October 6, 2010. Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint and the clerk of court closed the case.

Now plaintiff has filed a motion for leave to file an amended complaint, dkt. #8. He has not provided a proposed amended complaint with his motion but states that he will provide shorter allegations in his proposed complaint. In addition, he asks that less stringent pleading standards be applied to him because he is a pro se litigant.

Because this case is closed, I will construe plaintiff's motion as one to reopen the case and will deny the motion. As I explained to plaintiff in the previous order, this court construes pro se complaints liberally. However, plaintiff is still required to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. His complaint must be intelligible and provide notice to defendants of the claims being brought against them. Plaintiff had an opportunity to file an amended complaint but failed to do so within the required time period and has not

submitted a proposed amended complaint demonstrating his willingness to comply with the rules. Thus, plaintiff has provided no reason for the court to reopen his case.

ORDER

Plaintiff Charles Pride's motion to reopen the case and file an amended complaint, dkt. #8, is DENIED.

Entered this 8th day of November, 2010.

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