

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS CHERF,

Plaintiff,

No. C 01-3006 PJH

v.

NOTICENATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY
BOARD, et al.,Defendants.

The court is in receipt of an application to proceed in forma pauperis, as well as a document citing the above-referenced case number and entitled "Document 29 (Does not make sense)(Due to the Vast Response of Slander)."

To the extent plaintiff has filed an in forma pauperis application in the present action, such a request is completely improper. The court reminds plaintiff that the instant action was dismissed with prejudice more than eight years ago, on June 12, 2002. A judgment was entered that same day. The case is therefore closed, and plaintiff's present in forma pauperis application is to no effect. As such, it is insufficient to support any judicial action by this court. The court reminded plaintiff of such more than two years ago, on August 14, 2008, the last occasion on which plaintiff filed a similarly inappropriate filing in this action.

As for plaintiff's accompanying document, it is incomprehensible and largely non-sensical, making it impossible for the court to determine the purpose of the document or identify any specific request being made therein by plaintiff.

For the foregoing reasons, the court takes no action on either of plaintiff's filings. If it is plaintiff's intention to file a brand new action, alleging new facts, then plaintiff must re-file his papers as a new civil case filing with the clerk of the court.

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

Plaintiff is once again instructed to refrain from filing any further letters in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 30, 2010



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge