

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

DONALD MAIER,

Petitioner,

v.

WOOD COUNTY COURTHOUSE;
JUDGE ZAPPEN, Wood County; JUDGE
MASON, Wood County; JUDGE POTTOR,
(DA 1998); DA LAMBERT, Wood County;
JUDGE FLUGAR, Portage County; JUDGE
CARLSON, Taylor County; D.A. SWEIG,
Clark County; DEPUTY MARK NEWMEN,
Wood County; DEPUTY DAVID SADOSKI,
Columbia County; DEPUTY CORY OTTO,
Columbia County; CITY OF WISCONSIN
RAPIDS POLICE DEPARTMENT; MAYOR
GERALD BACH; POLICE INSPECTOR
MIKE RUDE; OFFICER RANDY JOHNS;
SGT. BRIAN KRZYKOWSKI; LT. JEFF
CONRADT; OFFICER JACKIE WAITE;
many more unknown named officers at
this time; STATE OF WISCONSIN;
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE JIM DOYLE;
WISCONSIN STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S
OFFICE; WISCONSIN JUDICIAL
COMMISSIONS JAME C ALEXANDER;
STANLEY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION;
WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS,

Respondents.

ORDER

07-C-580-C

This is a civil action in which petitioner, a resident of Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin, seeks to proceed pro se and in forma pauperis. In an order entered on October 24, 2007, I noted that petitioner's complaint did not comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 because it was impossible to determine precisely whom he was suing and what he was alleging each respondent did to violate his constitutional rights and when they did it. For this reason, I directed petitioner to submit, no later than November 7, 2007, a new complaint that complied with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8. I advised petitioner that if, by November 7, 2007, he failed to file the required amended complaint or show cause for his failure to do so, then I would dismiss this case without prejudice on the court's own motion.

Now petitioner has submitted a response to the October 24 order in which he asks that this court "put a hold" on his deadline so that he can "find an out of state attorney to help [him] with this and my appeal."

It is not this court's practice to stay proceedings and permit unlimited extensions of time to pro se litigants who hope at some future time to cure fatal flaws in their pleadings. Particularly where, as here, petitioner has not paid the \$350 fee for filing his complaint, he will suffer no prejudice if I dismiss his case, with the understanding that he can refile it at some future time after he has obtained the assistance he desires. Therefore, I will deny petitioner's motion for an enlargement of time in which to file a new complaint that

complies with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 and dismiss this case without prejudice to petitioner's refiling it at some future time.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that petitioner's motion for an extension of time within which to file a new complaint that complies with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 is DENIED and this case is DISMISSED without prejudice to petitioner's refiling his lawsuit at some future time.

Entered this 7th day of November, 2007.

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