IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 11-cv-01459-CMA-KLM

LORAL HUFFMAN,

Plaintiff,

٧.

DR. ALLRED, DR. CARTER, SANCHEZ, Case Manager, DERR, Unit Manager, JOHN DOE, Mailroom Supervisor, JANE DOE, Food Supervisor, BUCKNER, Investigator, LINCOLN, D.H.O., and CRANK, Trust Manager,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on **Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration** [Docket No. 158; Filed December 28, 2011], **Motion for Copy of Entire File** [Docket No. 159; Filed December 28, 2011], **Motion for Extension and Copy of Affidavit** [Docket No. 160; Filed December 28, 2011, and **Motion to Clarify Date** [Docket No. 161; Filed December 28, 2011].

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motion for Reconsideration [#158] is **DENIED**. Plaintiff provides no legal authority for his request, and the Court will not construct an argument on his behalf. See Whitney v. New Mexico, 113 F.3d 1170, 1173-74 (10th Cir. 1997) (The Court should not be a pro se litigant's advocate, nor should the Court "supply additional factual allegations to round out [a pro se litigant's] complaint or construct a legal theory on [his] behalf.") (internal citation omitted).

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the Motion for Copy of Entire File [#159] is **GRANTED IN PART** as follows. The Clerk's Office is directed to mail to Plaintiff a copy of the docket and a copy of the Orders located at Docket Nos. 76, 85, 108, 119, 128, 135, 137, 140, 149, and 153. The Court grants this request as a one-time courtesy to Plaintiff. The Court reminds Plaintiff that regardless of his *in forma pauperis* status, he is not entitled

to unlimited cost-free copies and forms in this litigation. See Windsor v. Martindale, 175 F.R.D. 665, 670-72 (D. Colo. 1997).

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the Motion for Extension and Copy of Affidavit [#160] is **GRANTED IN PART** as follows. The Clerk's Office is directed to mail to Plaintiff a copy of Dr. Clemmer's affidavit located at Docket No. 139. The Motion is **DENIED AS MOOT** in all other respects, as the District Court affirmed the December 8, 2011 Recommendation on December 28, 2011 [#153].

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that the Motion to Clarify Date [#161] is **DENIED AS MOOT**. All of Plaintiff's motions seeking to hold Defendants in contempt of court have been resolved.

Dated: December 30, 2011