

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

SUSAN ANN SANDS-WEDEWARD,

Plaintiff,

v.

PATRICK R. DONAHOE, Postmaster General,
United States Postal Service (Great Lakes Area) agency,

Defendant.

ORDER

12-cv-266-bbc

In this civil action for monetary relief, plaintiff Susan Ann Sands-Wedeward, who is proceeding pro se, contended that defendant Patrick Donahoe, Postmaster General of the United States Postal Service, should be liable for injuries she suffered while working as an employee of the United States Postal Service. In two previous orders, I granted defendant's motions to dismiss plaintiff's complaints in this case, concluding that plaintiff's complaints violated Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 and failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. Dkt. ##10, 19. In the most recent dismissal order entered on October 18, 2012, I told plaintiff that she could have one final opportunity to file a complaint that complied with the federal rules. On October 22, plaintiff filed a letter with the court regarding her claims. Dkt. #20.

In an order entered on November 21, 2012, I concluded that plaintiff had failed to file an amended complaint complying with the rules and I instructed the clerk of court to enter judgment for defendant and close the case. Dkt. #21. Plaintiff has now filed a motion

for reconsideration of the dismissal order, explaining that her October 22 letter should have been considered as a response to the court's previous dismissal order. Dkt. #25.

I am denying the motion for reconsideration. Even if I construe plaintiff's October 22 letter as a proposed amended complaint, I would dismiss this case because the letter does not correct any of the problems identified in the previous two orders dismissing plaintiff's claims. As I explained previously, plaintiff's complaints in this case have been unorganized and incoherent. They contained vague allegations about a variety of injuries she suffered during and after her employment with the postal service, but it was impossible to tell from plaintiff's complaint what specific claims she was asserting against defendant and why she believed defendant should be liable for any injuries she suffered. In the October 18 order, I gave plaintiff specific instructions about how to draft a complaint. For example, I told her to include only allegations relevant to her claims against *defendant* and to state those allegations in simple, concise and numbered paragraphs. I also told plaintiff to identify clearly what rights she believes were violated and to address each right separately.

Unfortunately, plaintiff did not follow any of the instructions I provided in the previous two orders. Her most recent proposed complaint is as vague and confusing as her previous complaints. Plaintiff did not organize her allegations and did not focus on actions that could be attributable to defendant. Instead of explaining why she believes defendant should be liable for injuries she suffered, plaintiff's complaint focuses primarily on allegations about her ex-husband and divorce, a former co-worker and her son's medical issues. Her complaint contains no specific allegations that would support a claim against defendant. In

fact, I still cannot determine what claims plaintiff is attempting to assert against defendant.

Plaintiff had multiple opportunities to file a complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and did not do so. Thus, dismissal of this case was appropriate. Stanard v. Nygren, 658 F.3d 792, 798 (7th Cir. 2011) (citations omitted) (“[W]here the lack of organization and basic coherence renders a complaint too confusing to determine the facts that constitute the alleged wrongful conduct, dismissal is an appropriate remedy.”). Accordingly, I am denying plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Susan Ann Sands-Wedeward’s motion for reconsideration, dkt. #25, is DENIED.

Entered this 17th day of December, 2012.

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