

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 10-cv-00357-CMA-MEH

MARCO A. ROCHA,

Plaintiff,

v.

A. ZAVARAS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on March 18, 2010.

Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order [[filed February 19, 2010; docket #2](#)] is **denied as moot**. The Court construes this motion as a request for photocopies, in light of Plaintiff's belief at the time he filed this motion that his Complaint was filed without the inclusion of Claim Nine. After review of Plaintiff's Complaint on the docket, the Court notes that the Complaint includes all thirty five pages and nine claims referred to in Plaintiff's motion. (*See* docket #4.)

Importantly, the Court emphasizes to Plaintiff that "[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.

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).