

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

-----  
RICHARD SOELDNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BANK OF NEW YORK and  
NATIONAL GRID PLC,

Defendants.  
-----

ORDER

06-C-384-C

On July 17, 2006, I directed the clerk of court to return to plaintiff the filing fee he had paid in the above-captioned case because the “complaint” he had submitted was utterly incomprehensible. Now plaintiff has filed a new pleading, also captioned as a complaint, along with several other papers that I construe as a motion for reconsideration of the decision to close this case file.

In its entirety, plaintiff’s motion reads:

The Judge  
Did Write  
The Complaint  
Did Not Have  
The Correct  
Wording

As Written.

Wisconsin  
Department  
Of Agriculture

only for

In state

The Judge  
Rules  
Against  
The  
Plaintiff

The Judge  
Is  
Favoring  
The  
Defendant

The  
Joinder  
The Defendants

Shall enter

At Issue

Send  
The  
Package  
By

|                    |
|--------------------|
| Registered<br>Mail |
|--------------------|

Attached to plaintiff's motion is an abbreviated version of the "complaint" he filed initially in this case on July 13, 2006. The second version is no more comprehensible than the first. It does not identify in any way how plaintiff believes the defendants in this case have wronged him, other than to say that plaintiff has not received common stock (from whom or why, he does not say). Because plaintiff's proposed "complaint" fails still to include the "short, plain statement" required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 8, his motion for reconsideration will be denied.

#### ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the court's July 17, 2006 order is DENIED.

Entered this 15th day of August, 2006.

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