

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

CHARLES WILLIAM HOOPER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAPTAIN CORONADO, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

10-cv-743-slc

CHARLES WILLIAM HOOPER,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER MYERS,

Defendant.

ORDER

11-cv-11-slc

CHARLES WILLIAM HOOPER,

Plaintiff,

v.

LT. GARY PEDERSON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

11-cv-571-slc

The court dismissed all three of these lawsuits with prejudice under Fed. R. Civ. 9. 41(b) because plaintiff Charles Hooper repeatedly delayed his responses to court orders and discovery requests over several months. Plaintiff later moved to reopen case nos. 10-cv-743-slc and 11-cv-571-slc under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), claiming that he was incarcerated and had no way of getting in contact with the court. Although I allowed the defendants in those two cases an opportunity to be heard and required plaintiff to explain the specific details surrounding his incarceration and failure to respond to the court's orders, plaintiff failed to answer the court's questions, alleging only that he was falsely incarcerated for two months in Wisconsin. However, defendants submitted an affidavit from an officer with the Juneau County Sheriff's Department who averred that plaintiff was incarcerated for less than 12 hours in May 2012. As a result, I entered an order on June 18, 2012, denying plaintiff's motion to reopen cases 10-743 and 11-571.

Now plaintiff has filed another motion to reopen (the second for cases 10-743 and 11-571 and his first for case no. 11-11), in which he repeats his unsupported allegation that he was incarcerated from March through May, 2012. As discussed in my previous order denying the initial motion to reopen, the record before the court indicates that plaintiff was incarcerated for less than 12 hours during the period in question. This does not constitute a good reason for failing to respond to this court's previous orders and deadlines. This court will not consider any further motions for reconsideration or motions to reopen filed by plaintiff.

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Charles Hooper's second motion to reopen is DENIED.

Entered this 23rd day of August, 2012.

BY THE COURT

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge