

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILSON GORRELL,
Plaintiff,
v.
THOMAS C. SNEATH et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:12-cv-00554 AWI JLT
ORDER DISREGARDING REPLY TO ANSWER
(Doc. 21)

On August 21, 2012, Plaintiff filed his “reply” to Defendants’ answer. (Doc. 21) Plaintiff is advised that a reply to an answer is not procedurally proper. If he wishes to file a motion, he must outline the relief sought and support his entitlement to this relief with citation to legal authorities.

The fact that Plaintiff is proceeding pro se does not relieve him of the obligation of filing papers that are legally sound and which are supported by proper legal authorities and analysis. The mere fact that he is proceeding pro se does not allow him to file a document that says, in essence, “I disagree with the Defendants; Court, you figure it out.” The obligation to prosecute this case remains with Plaintiff no matter that he is not represented by an attorney.

Notably, this is the second procedurally improper filing made by Plaintiff within less than a month. **Plaintiff is admonished that he may file only procedurally proper motions that are**

1 **supported by analysis and legal authorities.** Therefore, the Court **DISREGARDS** Plaintiff's
2 reply to the answer. (Doc. 21)

3

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: August 22, 2012

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28