

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
JONESBORO DIVISION**

JACK LEROY RAGLAND, JR.
ADC #120730

PLAINTIFF

V.

3:08CV00203 JMM/JTR

KEITH MILAM; and
J.T. LILLARD, Officers,
Craighead County Detention Center

DEFENDANTS

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Plaintiff, who was formerly incarcerated at the Cummins Unit of the Arkansas Department of Correction (“ADC”), has commenced this *pro se* § 1983 action alleging that Defendants violated his constitutional rights. *See* docket entry #1, #2, and #8. On July 14, 2009, the Court entered an Order granting Defendants’ Motion to Compel and giving Plaintiff, until August 13, 2009, to *file* his Answers to Defendants’ Interrogatories and Requests for Production. *See* docket entry #26.

On July 22, 2009, Plaintiff’s copy of the July 14, 2009 Order was returned as undeliverable because he had been released from the ADC. *See* docket entry #28. Despite the fact that he has been previously notified of his obligations under Local Rule 5.5(c)(2), Plaintiff has not provided a forwarding address or otherwise communicated with the Court since his release from the ADC.¹

¹ Local Rule 5.5(c)(2) provides that: “It is the duty of any party not represented by counsel to promptly notify the Clerk and the other parties to the proceedings of any change in his or her address, to monitor the progress of the case, and to prosecute or defend the action diligently. A party appearing for himself/herself shall sign his/her pleadings and state his/her address, zip code, and telephone number. If any communication from the Court to a *pro se* plaintiff is not responded to within thirty (30) days, the case may be dismissed without prejudice. Any party proceeding *pro se* shall be expected to be familiar with and follow the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.”


See docket entries #3 and #10. Further, Plaintiff has failed to comply with the July 14, 2009 Order, and the time for doing so has expired.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. Pursuant to Local Rule 5.5(c)(2), this case is DISMISSED, WITHOUT PREJUDICE, due to Plaintiff's failure to timely and properly comply with the Court's July 14, 2009 Order.

2. The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an *in forma pauperis* appeal from this Order of Dismissal and the accompanying Judgment would not be taken in good faith.

Dated this 31 day of August, 2009.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE