

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

PAUL WROBEL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	1:21-cv-00028-JDL
)	
STATE OF MAINE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**ORDER ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND COK WARNING**

Plaintiff Paul Wrobel, who is self-represented, filed his Complaint against the State of Maine and the Maine Attorney General on January 21, 2021, asserting various claims based on the alleged actions of state and federal officials (ECF No. 1). The Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint on March 9, 2021 (ECF No. 9), and Wrobel filed a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings on April 22, 2021 (ECF No. 11). United States Magistrate Judge John C. Nivison filed his Recommended Decision on the parties' motions on July 20, 2021 (ECF No. 15), pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2021) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time within which to file objections has expired, and no objections have been filed. The Magistrate Judge provided notice that a party's failure to object would waive the right to *de novo* review and appeal.

I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record, and have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge. I concur with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge

for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

This is the third action that Wrobel has brought in this Court since November 2020, all of which involve the same meritless claims against a variety of state and federal elected officials. *See Wrobel v. Maine*, No. 1:20-cv-00430-JDL, ECF No. 1 (Nov. 16, 2020); *Wrobel v. Maine*, No. 1:20-cv-00425-JDL, ECF No. 1 (Nov. 12, 2020). Wrobel's claims have no legal basis, and his pleadings and filings in this case, as in the two he commenced in November 2020, are frivolous.

Although Wrobel is representing himself, he may not submit “[g]roundless and inappropriate filings” to the Court. *D’Amario v. United States*, 251 F.R.D. 63, 64 (D. Me. 2008). “[F]rivolous filings waste judicial resources” and inhibit the resolution of substantial matters. *Adams v. Adams*, No. 1:17-cv-00200-GZS, 2019 WL 2814627, at *1 (D. Me. July 2, 2019).

In light of Wrobel's repeated frivolous filings, the Court hereby issues a *Cok* warning: **Any further frivolous filings by Wrobel, in this docket or in a new case, may result in an immediate Order restricting his ability to file documents with the Court.** *See Cok v. Family Court of R.I.*, 985 F.2d 32, 35-36 (1st Cir. 1993). Those restrictions may include: requiring Wrobel to accompany any future pleading with an affidavit that it does not raise the same issues that this Court has previously dismissed, as well as a concise summary of the new claim; limiting his ability to file documents within a new action without Court approval; limitations on the number and length of Wrobel's filings; and other restrictions to screen out frivolous filings. *See Castro v. United States*, 775 F.2d 399, 408-09 (1st Cir. 1985) (per

curiam) (noting that when a litigant shows a “propensity to file repeated suits . . . involving the same or similar claims” of a “frivolous or vexatious nature,” limitations on further filings may be appropriate); *see also Procup v. Strickland*, 792 F.2d 1069, 1072-73 (11th Cir. 1986) (listing illustrative restrictions).

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 15) of the Magistrate Judge is **ACCEPTED**. The Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 9) is **GRANTED**, and Wrobel’s Complaint (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED**. In light of this disposition, Wrobel’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (ECF No. 11) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated this 30th day of August, 2021.

 /s/ JON D. LEVY
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE