

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

SYLVESTER JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

RANDALL HEPP, JUDY SMITH,
DEBRA BOYD, RICK RAEMISCH,
GARY HAMBLIN, M. OLSEN,
P. SCHULZ, TAMMY MAASSEN,
CAPT. COOK, CAPT. FOSTER,
CAPT. JENSEN, LT. LACOST,
SGT. GARCIA, SGT. GEROGE,
DGT. GILLET, C/O LEE, T. MARCO,
C/O OLSON, C/O PETKOVSEK,
C/O BIDDLE, DEBRA TIDQUIST,
KENNETH ADLER, GEORGIA KOSTOHRYZ,
MS. DOUGHERTY, MR. FLIEGER,

Defendants.

ORDER

16-cv-542-bbc

On August 1, 2016, pro se prisoner Sylvester Jackson filed a complaint in which he raised dozens of claims against 25 different defendants. After reviewing the complaint in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 and 1915A, I concluded in an order dated September 27, 2016 that plaintiff had improperly joined many of his claims and that his claims belonged in 12 separate lawsuits. Dkt. #7. I gave him an October 12, 2016 deadline to do two things: (1) identify for the court which of the 12 sets of claims he wanted to pursue in this lawsuit; and (2) tell the court which other sets of claims he wished to pursue in separate

cases and which sets of claims he wished to dismiss without prejudice to his refiling them at a later date.

On October 13, 2016, the court received plaintiff's response, but it did not comply with the court's order. Although plaintiff said that he wanted to pursue a set of claims that the court had called "Lawsuit #1," he did not say what he wanted to do with the other claims. Instead, he said that he planned to file a motion for reconsideration "within a few days." Dkt. #8. He did not say why he did not include the motion with his response. In light of plaintiff's failure to comply with the September 27 order, the court took no action after receiving plaintiff's response.

On October 31, 2016, the court received a motion from plaintiff in which he asked for two more weeks to file a motion for reconsideration on the ground that he was "experiencing an unknown medical condition in both hands that extremely limits his ability to write." Dkt. #9. He did not provide any other details about his condition and he provided no medical documentation to support his allegation. However, I gave plaintiff until November 15, 2016, to either (1) file a motion for reconsideration of the September 27, 2016 order; or (2) inform the court that he is not filing a motion for reconsideration of the September 27, 2016 order and then identify which Lawsuits identified in that order he wishes to pursue in separate cases and which Lawsuits he wishes to dismiss without prejudice to his refiling them at a later date. I told plaintiff that if he did not respond by November 15, 2016, I would direct the clerk of court to close the case administratively. Dkt. #10.

Now plaintiff has filed another request for an extension of time, again citing an

unknown medical problem. Dkt. #11. However, he still has not provided any medical documentation or explanation of his medical condition, such as the symptoms he is experiencing or how the condition is preventing him from writing. In addition, plaintiff provided no information about the progress he has made on his motion or how much longer he believes it will take him to draft it.

As noted above, this case cannot move forward until plaintiff decides what to do with all of his claims. Although plaintiff has identified one set of claims he wishes to pursue, he has not told the court what to do with the remaining claims. Because plaintiff has not given any indication that he will make that decision any time soon, I am denying his request for an extension of time and administratively closing the case. Plaintiff is free to ask the court to reopen the case when he is ready if he has good cause for doing so, but he should keep in mind that the longer he waits, the stronger the showing he will have to make that he has good cause.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Sylvester Jackson's motion for an extension of time, dkt. #11, is DENIED. The clerk of court is directed to administratively close the case. The

court will reopen the case in the event that plaintiff files a motion showing that there is good cause for doing so.

Entered this 22d day of November, 2016.

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