

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 09-cv-02817-REB-MEH

JUSTIN JOSEPH RUEB,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARISTEDES ZAVARAS and
SUSAN JONES,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on February 11, 2010.

Plaintiff's Motion for An Order Ordering the Defendants to Allow Plaintiff Rueb to Make Whatever Amounts of Pleading Photocopy Sets as are Necessary to Comply with Court Requirements [filed February 8, 2010; docket #17] is **denied**. "A prisoner's right of access to the court does not include the right of free unlimited access to a photocopying machine, particularly when as here, there are suitable alternatives." *Holt v. Werholtz*, 185 F. App'x 737, 740 (10th Cir. 2006) (citing *Harrell v. Keohane*, 621 F.2d 1059, 1061 (10th Cir. 1980)). The suitable alternative, as in *Holt* and *Harrell*, is producing hand-written copies.

The Court notes that the Bureau of Prison's Executive Order setting the price of photocopies in the federal prison system was issued in June 2008. (Docket #17 at 1, 8.) Plaintiff initiated this action in December 2009. (See docket #3.) Thus, Plaintiff had plenty of notice as to the potential cost of filing and prosecuting a civil lawsuit. Although Plaintiff is proceeding in this case without an attorney, he bears the responsibility of prosecuting this case with due diligence. The Court must liberally construe *pro se* filings; however, *pro se* status does not excuse the obligation of any litigant to comply with the same rules of procedure that govern other litigants. See *Green v. Dorrell*, 969 F.2d 915, 917 (10th Cir. 1992); see also *Nielsen v. Price*, 17 F.3d 1276, 1277 (10th Cir. 1994).