

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 10-cv-00333-ZLW

LAUREN NETTINA,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (DOJ) AND AFFILIATES,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
PENTAGON,
WHITE HOUSE: PRESIDENT BARRACK [sic] OBAMA AND
FIRST LADY MICHELLE OBAMA,
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL,
FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD,
UNITED STATES CONGRESS,
FORMER PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH JR.,
FORMER FIRST LADY LAURA BUSH,
FORMER WHITE HOUSE CHIEF OF STAFF JOSHUA BOLTEN, and
POLICE AND TROOPER DEPARTMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Defendants.

FILED
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DENVER, COLORADO

APR 13 2010

GREGORY C. LANGHAM
CLERK

ORDER IMPOSING SANCTIONS

Plaintiff, Lauren Nettina, initiated this action by filing *pro se* a complaint pursuant to "401 Congressional Declaration of Purpose Executive Order 12333 U.S. Intelligence Activities," Whistle Blower Protection Act of 1989, and United States constitutional amendments I, IV, V, VIII, XIII, and XIV. **See** complaint at 4-5. Ms. Nettina was granted leave to proceed in this action pursuant to the federal *in forma pauperis* statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

In an order filed on March 12, 2010, the Court dismissed the complaint and the action pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B) as factually frivolous and ordered Ms. Nettina to show cause within twenty days why she should not be enjoined from initiating any further actions in this Court without first seeking prior leave of Court. On March 18, 2010, Ms. Nettina filed her response to the order to show cause. In the response to the show cause order, Ms. Nettina states:

I do not believe I should be prohibited from initiating any further civil actions in this court without seeking leave of the court nor do I believe the content of the submitted motions fall within the moot doctrine. I have included a listing of the proposed initial set of civil cases I would like to submit to the court over time that could increase to over 200. Once I secure employment, I plan to meet the filing fee requirements over time.

Although the information I have documented for the court may be provable over due process through various mechanisms, I understand the rationale for the dismissal. I believe this case content represents *multiple* constitutional violations especially related to privacy as well as a societal controversy. Therefore, I will appeal this dismissal through the United States Court of Appeals.

Response to the Orders from Judgment at 2. Otherwise, the response is nonresponsive. On April 6, 2010, Ms. Nettina appealed from the dismissal order and judgment.

The Court finds that Ms. Nettina has failed within the time allowed to show cause why she should not be enjoined from initiating any further actions in this Court without first seeking prior leave of Court. Therefore, Ms. Nettina will be prohibited from initiating a civil action in this Court without the representation of an attorney admitted to practice in this Court unless she first obtains leave of Court to proceed *pro se*. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff, Lauren Nettina, is prohibited from initiating a civil action in this Court without the representation of an attorney admitted to practice in this Court unless she first obtains leave of Court to proceed *pro se*. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to permit electronic filing submitted on April 6, 2010 is denied as moot.

DATED at Denver, Colorado, this 13th day of April, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

s/Philip A. Brimmer
PHILIP A. BRIMMER
United States District Judge, for
ZITA LEESON WEINSHIENK, Senior Judge
United States District Court

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Civil Action No. 10-cv-00333-ZLW

Lauren Nettina
4547 Chesnut Ridge Road
Unit 111B
West Amherst, NY 14228

I hereby certify that I have mailed a copy of the **ORDER** to the above-named individuals on 4/13/10

GREGORY C. LANGHAM, CLERK

By: 

Deputy Clerk