Hickey v. Donahoe Doc. 37

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO Magistrate Judge Boyd N. Boland

C:	Action	NI	12 077	0.1054		DNID
CIVII	Action	INO.	15-00-	ひょひょうサー	UNIA	-DIND

LYNDA S. HICKEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

PATRICK R. DONAHOE, Postmaster General,

Defendant.

ORDER

This matter arises on the following motions filed on August 16, 2013:

- (1) **Motion to Consolidate EEOC Findings** [Doc. #31] (the "Motion to Consolidate");
- (2) **Corrected Motion to Compel the Court's Ruling** [Doc. #32] (the "Corrected Motion to Compel"); and
- (3) **Motion to Appoint Attorney Per EEOC Findings** [Doc. #33] (the "Motion to Appoint Attorney").

The Motions are DENIED.

The plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. I must liberally construe her pleadings. <u>Haines v. Kerner</u>, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972). I cannot act as advocate for a *pro se* litigant, however, who must comply with the fundamental requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. <u>Hall v. Bellmon</u>, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991).

Motion to Consolidate

The Motion to Consolidate consists of the following paragraph:

Comes now . . . Plaintiff in this action to move the court to consolidate the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC's) findings regarding the breech [sic] of contact allegations attached as Exhibit X to the Title VII Complaint in this action dated 26 Apr 13. Specifically, the Plaintiff moves to consolidate the EEOC findings on appeal dated 15 May 13 identified as Hickey v. Donahoe Appeal No. 0120131157, Agency No. 4E-800-0108012 and Appeal No. 0120121281, Agency No. 4E-800-0110-05 for their relevance to this action and move to incorporate them in their entirety into the Title VII Complaint and attach them thereto as Exhibit X, pages 9 to 21 citing the EEOC declaration therein to my right to pursue their adjudication in Federal District Court.

It appears that the plaintiff is attempting to amend her Complaint, but the nature of the amendment is unclear. The plaintiff did not attach the EEOC findings to the Motion to Consolidate, and I do not find them in the record.

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide that a request for a court order must "state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order" and must "state the relief sought." Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1)(B) and (C). The Motion to Consolidate is incomprehensible and fails to specify either any grounds for relief or the precise nature of the relief sought. Accordingly, the Motion to Consolidate is denied.

Corrected Motion to Compel

I previously denied the plaintiff's "Motion to Compel the Court's Ruling" [Doc. #25]. I stated:

The plaintiff seeks to compel the court to "rule on the Plaintiff's previously entered Motion(s) to Consolidate EEOC Findings and Appoint Attorney Per EEOC Findings submitted on 11 Jun 13."

My review of the record does not reveal any such motion(s)

pending. The Motion to Compel Ruling is denied.

Order Issued August 8, 2013 [Doc. #29].

In her Corrected Motion to Compel, the plaintiff argues that the court is in receipt of the

motions. I have issued a ruling on the matter. The Corrected Motion to Compel is denied.

Motion to Appoint Attorney

The plaintiff also seeks appointment of counsel to assist her in this case. She filed a

motion to appoint counsel on May 14, 2013 [Doc. #12], which I denied [Doc. #18]; and she filed

a motion to reconsider my order [Doc. #19] which I also denied [Doc. #21]. Her current motion

contains duplicate pages from her previous motions. The plaintiff's request for appointment of

counsel has been denied, and she may not file redundant motions.

IT IS ORDERED:

(1) The Motion to Consolidate EEOC Findings [Doc. #31] is DENIED;

(2) The Corrected Motion to Compel the Court's Ruling [Doc. #32] is DENIED;

(3) The Motion to Appoint Attorney Per EEOC Findings [Doc. #33] is DENIED;

(4) In the future, all requests for a court order shall comply with Rule 7;

(5) The plaintiff shall cease filing redundant motions; and

(6) Failure to comply with this order may result in sanctions, including dismissal of this

case with prejudice.

Dated November 4, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland

United States Magistrate Judge

3