

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

7

8

9

John Calvin Neuendorf, II,

)

No. CV 10-724-PHX-RCB (DKD)

10

Plaintiff,

)

**ORDER**

11

vs.

)

12

Bette Jan Steinhillber, et al.,

)

13

Defendant.

)

14

15

16

Pending in this closed case is Plaintiff’s “Motion: For Transcripts of Comple[te Record” (Doc. 11), which the Court will deny.

17

18

**I. Procedural Background**

19

On March 31, 2010, Plaintiff John Calvin Neuendorf, II, who is confined in the Maricopa County Fourth Avenue Jail, filed a *pro se* civil rights Complaint (Doc. 1) and an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (Doc. 3). By Order filed May 5, 2010 (Doc. 5), the Court granted Plaintiff’s Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, assessed a partial filing fee of \$1.53, and dismissed the Complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff was given 30 days from the filing date of the Order to file a first amended complaint in compliance with the Order. The Clerk of Court was directed to enter a judgment of dismissal of this action without prejudice and without further notice to Plaintiff if he failed to file a first amended complaint within 30 days.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

When Plaintiff failed to comply with the Court’s May 5, 2010 Order (Doc. 5), the

1 Clerk of Court entered a Judgment of dismissal of this action on June 21, 2010 (Doc. 7).  
2 Then, on July 8, 2010, Plaintiff filed a "Motion to the Court" (Doc. 8), in which he asked for  
3 "extensions & or the re[opening and new directives" for this and two other cases. By Order  
4 filed September 16, 2010 (Doc. 10), the Court denied Plaintiff's "Motion to the Court"  
5 (Doc. 8), which the Court construed as being brought pursuant to Rule 59(e) of the Federal  
6 Rules of Civil Procedure, and directed the Clerk of Court not to file Plaintiff's lodged Second  
7 Amended Complaint (Doc. 9). This case was ordered to remain closed.

8 **II. Motion for Transcripts of Complete Record**

9 On October 5, 2010, Plaintiff filed a "Motion: For Transcripts of Comple[te Record"  
10 (Doc. 11), in which he requests that the Court send him a copy of all the cases he has filed  
11 with this Court because his "paperwork has been destroyed from flooding and is no longer  
12 legible." Plaintiff alleges that his "cell was flooded from people throwing water in a bucket  
13 under [his] door." Plaintiff further alleges that his "files are ruined."

14 Plaintiff's Motion will be denied. This Court is not in a position to act as a copy  
15 service for Plaintiff. Moreover, this case is closed and must remain closed.

16 **IT IS ORDERED:**

17 (1) Plaintiff's "Motion: For Transcripts of Comple[te Record" (Doc. 11) is  
18 **denied.**

19 (2) This case **must remain closed.**

20 DATED this 24th day of January, 2011.

21  
22  
23   
24 Robert C. Broomfield  
25 Senior United States District Judge  
26  
27  
28