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

NATHANIEL ALLEN LINDELL,

ORDER

Plaintiff,

01-C-209-C

v.

GARY R. McCAUGHTRY,

Defendant.

On June 20, 2003, United States Magistrate Judge Stephen Crocker granted in part, denied in part and stayed in part plaintiff's motion to compel discovery and for sanctions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. Now plaintiff has submitted a letter dated June 24, 2003, which I construe as an objection to the magistrate judge's order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A).

As a preliminary matter, I note that it is becoming plaintiff's practice to put his motions in this and others cases in the form of letters addressed to me. This practice has resulted in unnecessary delay in routing and processing plaintiff's submissions because clerk's office staff must take the added step of obtaining direction from chambers whether plaintiff's

letter submissions require docketing.

Plaintiff is a seasoned litigant. He knows how to draft a motion. In the future, I will read plaintiff's letters to me as informative documents nothing more. I will not act on any request for action contained in the letter. Plaintiff must put all future requests for court action in the form of a formal motion. This will allow the deputy clerks processing plaintiff's papers to identify promptly what is in need of docketing and what is not.

The standard for reviewing a pretrial order of a magistrate judge is whether it is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). Nothing in plaintiff's objections to the magistrate judge's June 20 order convinces me that it was clearly erroneous or contrary to law for the magistrate judge to decline to sanction defense counsel and rule in the way that he did on plaintiff's motion to compel discovery.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the decision entered by the United States Magistrate Judge on June 17, 2003, remains as entered because plaintiff has failed to show that the decision is

clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

Entered this 18th day of July, 2003.

BY THE COURT:

BARBARA B. CRABB District Judge