

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

DAVIN ROLLINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DENNIS MCKNIGHT and
MICHAEL LEAHMAN,

Defendants.

ORDER

12-cv-389-lsa

The parties are briefing their competing motions for summary judgment in this case. Now before the court is plaintiff Davin Rollins's motion for an extension of time and a motion to allow plaintiff to access to the court's electronic database. *See* dkts. 76 and 61.

First, regarding the motion for extension of time, it appears that plaintiff has filed materials in support of his own motion for summary judgment and opposing defendants' motion. Accordingly, I will deny that motion as moot.

Next, I am denying plaintiff's motion to allow plaintiff to access to the court's electronic database because of cost and access concerns. This court uses an electronic database managed by Administrative Office of the United States Courts called PACER. The Judicial Conference of the United States requires that all registered individuals be charged a fee of \$0.10 for every electronic file they view. Plaintiff is in custody of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections at the Waupun Correctional Institution. This court cannot order his institution to provide access to internet sites, let alone one that charges fees.

In his motion to access the court's electronic database, plaintiff also asks if there is another way that he can provide his filings to the defendants because he does not like to use so many stamps. As I explained to plaintiff in the January 14, 2013 pretrial conference order, every document filed with the court in this lawsuit must be served on defendants' attorney. To the extent that the mailing of the documents is getting expensive, if plaintiff wants to try to work out other service agreement with defense counsel, he will have to do that himself, but he is not entitled to another procedure simply because stamps are costly.

Finally, plaintiff submitted a letter addressed to the clerk of court stating that he would like to renew his request for an attorney. *See* dkt. 41. I will construe this letter as a motion by plaintiff for assistance in the recruiting a lawyer. In his motion, plaintiff says that he is renewing his request for an attorney because this case is complicated and it is hard to understand the summary judgment procedures. As I stated in my January 25, 2013 order denying plaintiff's first motion for appointment of counsel, the court recognizes that a lawyer could do a better job for plaintiff than he can do for himself, but we don't have nearly enough lawyers available to handle all of the prisoner cases filed in this district. More importantly, plaintiff is doing a capable job of representing himself. Plaintiff's filings in this case have been relatively clear and appropriately directed. Because plaintiff has submitted no new argument that persuades me to change my prior decision, I will deny his second request for assistance in the recruitment of counsel.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's motion for extension of time, dkt. 76, is DENIED as moot.
2. Plaintiff's motion to allow plaintiff access to the court's electronic database, dkt. 61, is DENIED.
3. Plaintiff's renewed motion for assistance in recruiting counsel, dkt. 53 is DENIED without prejudice.

Entered this 20th day of August, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge