

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

---

WILSON JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

OPINION AND ORDER

12-cv-598-wmc

GARY HAMBLIN, CHARLES COLES,  
WELCOME ROSE, CHARLES FAKTOR,  
LORI ALSUM, JAMES GREER, DR.  
BURNETT, MARY MUSE, KAREN  
ANDERSON, ANDREA OLMANSON,  
ALL STAFF RELEVANT (JANE/JOHN  
DOES), J.B. VAN HOLLEN, JUDGE CRAIG  
R. DAY, LISAREINKE, MARTY BEIHL,  
TIMOTHY HAINES, WSPF'S ASSOCIATE /  
DEPUTY WARDEN (JOHN/JANE DOES),  
SWEENEY, DIANE ALDERSON, MARY  
MILLER, DR. BURTON COX, RUBIN, ASCH,  
SHANNON SHARPE, ALL WSPF CAPTAINS,  
BROWN, GARDER, GERL, SARAH MASON,  
BRIAN KOOL, ESSER, THE THREE NURSES  
FROM 8/2/11 ASSAULT (HEGE AND 2 JANE  
DOES), HEGE, KUSSMAL, HENNEMAN,  
RUSSELL HILL, PRIMMER, MICHAEL  
SHERMAN, MELI, OTHER JOHN DOES  
(WSPF E AND A UNIT SERGEANTS FROM 6/28/11),  
DRESSEN, LIEUTENANT TOM, SPECIAL  
NEEDSCOMMITTEE (JOHN/JANE DOES), and  
WSPF CELL EXTRACTION TEAM FROM 8/2/11  
ASSAULT (JOHN/JANE DOES),

Defendants.

---

The court previously dismissed plaintiff Wilson Jackson's complaint at the screening stage, finding that his claim fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. (11/29/12 Opinion & Order (dkt. #21).) In response, Jackson filed numerous

motions (dkt. ##23, 24, 25, 26, 27), none of which have merit and all of which the court will deny for the reasons stated below.

## OPINION

### **I. Motion Seeking Clarification of Judge Conley's Connections to Plaintiff's Usurpations of Wisconsin's Officers and Employments (dkt. #23)**

In the first motion, Jackson seeks information about my former employment, affiliations, and all former and current cases involving Attorney General J.B. Van Hollen or Assistant Attorney Generals. (Dkt. #23.) The only possible purpose of such a motion is to question whether I should have recused myself. Jackson offers no basis for recusal, nor is there one. The court denies Jackson's motion, but notes purely for his edification, that (1) the documents considered by the United States Senate in confirming my appointment to this court and the cases over which I preside are all a matter of public record and (2) these documents reflect the fact that my former employer and I had, for the most part, represented clients adverse to the State of Wisconsin and its various State Attorney Generals, including the current one.

### **II. Motion for Extension of Time in which to Perfect Appeal (dkt. #24)**

Next, Wilson seeks an extension of time to appeal "in the interests of justice." (Dkt. #24.) Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(1)(A) provides that the "notice of appeal required by Rule 3 must be filed with the district clerk within 30 days after entry of judgment or order appealed from." In this case, the judgment was entered on November 29, 2012. The court may extend the time to file the notice of appeal only

upon a showing of “excusable neglect or good cause.” Fed. R. App. P. 5(a)(5). Wilson provides no basis in his motion for extending the time, and certainly does not provide a reason which would constitute excusable neglect or good cause. Accordingly, the court will deny Wilson’s motion for extension of time to file his notice of appeal.

### **III. Motion Seeking Issuance of Temporary Preliminary Enjoinment and Order of Restraint (dkt. #25)**

Jackson also seeks a preliminary injunction, requiring defendants to provide him with (1) carbon paper, typewriter, writing desk and chair, ink pens to aid in his filing of documents to this court and (2) video recording of his cell to settle disputes as to what did or did not happen. To the extent Jackson is alleging that defendants are violating his right to access the courts, this is unrelated to his food strikes complaint and, therefore, any motion for preliminary injunction based on such a claim is not properly before the court. As for Jackson’s request for a video camera in his cell, there is no longer any dispute between the parties that is before this court for adjudication and, therefore, no legal basis for the court to enter such relief, even in the highly unlikely event it was warranted. Accordingly, the court will also deny this motion.

### **IV. Motion to Quash “Alleged” Ruling as “Unauthorized by Law” (dkt. #26)**

Jackson moves to quash the order denying him leave to proceed on the basis that it is not signed by the court. The order contains an electronic signature, which is authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as well as this court’s local rules, administrative orders and procedures. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(3) (“A court may, by local

rule, allow papers to be filed, signed or verified by electronic means that are consistent with any technical standards established by the Judicial Conference of the United States.”); W.D. Wis. Admin. Order 285 (adopting Local Rule 5); W.D. Wis. Local R. 5 (requiring electronic filing of papers); W.D. Wis. Admin. Procedure VI.A (“Any order filed electronically has the same force and effect as a paper order with a handwritten signature.”). In other words, the “/s” electronic signature on the November 29, 2012, order has the same force and effect as an order with a handwritten signature. Accordingly, the court will deny Jackson’s motion to “quash” the November 29, 2012, order.

**V. Motion Seeking the Issuance of Temporary Injunctions / In Alleviating the Affects of the Claimed Usurpations of Wis. Offices / Employments (dkt. #27)**

Finally, Jackson seeks an order requiring the U.S. Marshalls to take custody of him “until these matters are decided.” (Dkt. #27.) Given the court’s dismissal of Jackson’s complaint, there are no matters to be decided. Even if matters remained, Jackson has provided no basis for justifying the extreme relief requested. The court will also deny this motion.

**ORDER**

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Wilson Jackson’s pending motions (dkt. #24, 25, 26, 27) are DENIED.

Entered this 13th day of May, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM M. CONLEY

District Judge