

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

ALEKSANDRA CICHOWSKI and
CEZARY CICHOWSKI,

ORDER

Plaintiffs,

05-C-262-C

v.

FRED D. HOLLENBECK; TOM CASEY; DEBBIE KING;
SAUK COUNTY; JUDGES GUY REYNOLDS
AND EVENSON; DONNA MUELLER;
CARRIE WASTLICK; PEGGY; GENE WIEGAND;
BRANT BAILEY; CURAN HOLLENBECK AND ORTON, S.C.;
WAYNE MAFFEI; JENKS CROSS MERCER and MAFFEI LAW
FIRM; M&I BANK; DAVE GUTTER; KETTY W. BAUER;
DEBRA KING; MARK L. KRUEGER; WILLIAM
GREENHALGH; GREENHALGH and KRUEGER, S.C.;
THE BANK OF MAUSTON; ROBERT FAIT;
TOM SCHMIDT; KELLY HONNOLD;
SCOTT SCHMIDT; ADELA LUCARZ; and JOSEPH
LUCARZ;

Defendants.

In an order entered in this case on June 10, 2005, I gave plaintiffs until July 29, 2005, in which to submit proof that they have served their June 2, 2005 complaint on the defendants. Now plaintiff Aleksandra Cichowski has submitted forms reflecting the completion of service on some but not all of the defendants. In addition, plaintiff

Aleksandra Cichowski has filed a "Motion to Extend Time for Delivery of Summons and Complaint for Two Weeks," "Motion to Dismiss Attorney Krueger's Motion for Imposing Sanctions Dated July 26, 2005" and a document titled "Certification, Rule 11." Neither the motions nor the "certification" can be considered, however, because once again plaintiff Aleksandra Cichowski has made no showing that she served her submissions on her co-plaintiff, Cezary Cichowski, and the defendants or their lawyers. As I told plaintiff Aleksandra Cichowski in an order entered on July 15, 2005, it is her responsibility either to obtain her co-plaintiff's signature on her submissions or show clearly that she served a copy of her submissions on him. Moreover, I told plaintiff Cichowski that for every document she files with the court, she must show that she has served her submissions on the defendants or the lawyer for the defendants, once the names of the lawyers are known. Because plaintiff Aleksandra Cichowski has made no showing that she complied with the service requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 5, her motions and certification cannot be considered. If plaintiff Aleksandra Cichowski wishes the court to give consideration to her motions, she may have until August 8, 2005, in which to file an affidavit of service or other certification that she mailed a copy of her motions to her co-plaintiff and to the defendants or their lawyers if the defendants are represented by a lawyer. In the future, however, I will not afford plaintiff Cichowski second chances to submit proof of service. If she files any further documents that do not reflect her compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5, those documents will

be placed in the file and will not be considered.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Plaintiff Aleksandra Cichowski may have until August 8, 2005, in which to submit certification that she served her “Motion to Extend Time for Delivery of Summons and Complaint for Two Weeks,” “Motion to Dismiss Attorney Krueger’s Motion for Imposing Sanctions Dated July 26, 2005” and a document titled “Certification, Rule 11” on plaintiff Cezary Cichowski and the defendants or, where the defendants are represented by lawyers, on the lawyers.

2. If, by August 8, 2005, plaintiff Aleksandra Cichowski fails to rectify the record with certification that she served her recent filings in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5, I will give no consideration to plaintiff’s motions and enter an order dismissing all of the defendants who have not yet been served with plaintiffs’ June 2, 2005 complaint.

Entered this 3rd day of August, 2005.

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