IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

NATHANIEL ALLEN LINDELL,

ORDER

Plaintiff,

02-C-473-C

v.

STEVEN CASPERSON, MATTHEW FRANK,
JON E. LITSCHER, LAURA WOOD,
GERALD BERGE, PETER HUIBREGTSE,
GARY BOUGHTON, VICKI SEBASTIAN,
CPT. TIMOTHY HAINES, LINDA HODDY,
CINDY O'DONNELL, LT. GARDINER,
JULIE BIGGAR, SGT. HANKE, TODD OVERBO,
SANDRA GRONDIN, JOANNE GOUIERE (JANE DOE),
MIKE VANDERLOH, RON KOPLITZ, ELLEN RAY,
GARY McCAUGHTRY, MARC CLEMENTS,
DEBRA TETZLAFF, CPT. STEVE SCHUELER,
C.O. WATSON, CHAPLAIN FRANCIS,
BYRON BARTOW, KATHLEEN BELLAIRE,
and STEVE SPANBAUER,

\mathbf{r}			- 1		
11	<u>_</u>	On	1	201	1tc
v	L	CI.	lu	aı	its.

Plaintiff's motion to adjust the schedule for briefing the cross-motions for summary judgment filed in this case is DENIED. Plaintiff suggests that it will help reduce the amount of paper the parties are required to file in the case if he can file a reply to defendants'

opposition to his motion for summary judgment at the same time that he opposes

defendants' motion. While that may be true, I am not willing to disturb the schedules

already established by the magistrate judge for briefing dispositive motions. If plaintiff is

serious about reducing the amount of paper he must submit in connection with the motions

for summary judgment, he may wish to consider withdrawing his motion altogether. If he

were to choose this route, he could respond directly to defendants' proposed findings of fact

and use the same opportunity to propose additional findings of fact and evidence as the rules

governing motions for summary judgment allow.

Plaintiff also has filed a motion to sanction defendants for filing a motion to revoke

plaintiff's in forma pauperis status. That motion is DENIED.

Entered this 20th day of December, 2004.

BY THE COURT:

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge

2