

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
PINE BLUFF DIVISION**

ORLANDO LANCASTER

PLAINTIFF

v.

5:13CV00298-JJV

COURTNEY KELLEY, former  
Correctional Officer, Dub Brassell,  
Adult Detention Center, ADC

DEFENDANT

**ORDER**

On September 16, 2013, Orlando Lancaster (“Plaintiff”) filed a *pro se* Complaint (Doc. No. 2) and an Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Affidavit (Doc. No. 1). On September 30, 2013, Plaintiff’s Application was granted (Doc. No. 3) and he was informed of his duty to comply with Local Rule of the Court 5.5(c)(2)<sup>1</sup>. Local Rule 5.5(c)(2) requires a *pro se* plaintiff to “promptly” notify the Clerk of Court of any change in his address.

The docket reveals that Plaintiff failed to comply with Local Rule 5.5(c)(2). On May 2, 2014, a document mailed by the Clerk to Plaintiff was returned and marked “RTS [Return to Sender] (NOT HERE)” (Doc. No. 17). In response, the Court entered an Order on May 23, 2014, directing

---

<sup>1</sup>Local Rule of the Court 5.5(c)(2), states:

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.

Loc. R. 5.5(c)(2).

Plaintiff to provide the Clerk of Court with a current address (Doc. No. 18). On June 3, 2014, that Order was also returned as undeliverable (Doc. No. 19). More than fourteen days have elapsed since the Court directed Plaintiff to provide a new address. *Pro se* litigants must comply with all relevant rules of procedure. *See Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 834-835 n.46 (U.S. 1975). Here, Plaintiff has failed to do so and his claim is therefore DISMISSED.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED THAT:

1. Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. No. 2) is DISMISSED without prejudice.

Dated this 20th day of June, 2014.



---

JOE J. VOLPE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE