

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

ROY EDWARD CLINE,
Plaintiff,

v.

LAND & SEA BROKERS INC., et al.,
Defendants.

No. 3:14-cv-1983 (SRU) (WIG)

ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING RECOMMENDED RULING

On January 15, 2015, U.S. Magistrate Judge William I. Garfinkel docketed a Recommended Ruling of Dismissal (doc. #7) of the complaint filed by *pro se* plaintiff Roy Edward Cline. The Recommended Ruling correctly sets forth the reasons that Cline's complaint fails to state a cause of action.

Any objection to the Recommended Ruling was initially due by January 29, 2015. Cline filed a motion to extend that deadline (doc. #8) by thirty days, and the Court granted his motion (doc. 9). Cline filed a second motion to extend the deadline for filing an objection until April 29, 2015 (doc. 11). Before the Court ruled upon that motion, Cline filed a third motion to extend the objection deadline by ninety days (doc. 12); that motion was granted, and the deadline to file an objection was extended to May 25, 2015 (doc. 13). The latest deadline for filing an objection to the Recommended Ruling has passed without any objection being filed. Cline has, however, filed several other pleadings: a motion for sequestered information (doc. 15), a motion for a forty-five-day delay in order to obtain counsel (doc. 16), a motion for the appointment of counsel (doc. 17), and a letter to U.S. Senator Bernard ("Bernie") Sanders that was docketed as a notice of continued investigation (doc. 18).

Although I agree with Cline that he should secure the assistance of counsel if he wishes to pursue the allegations of this complaint, it is premature for the Court to appoint counsel for

him. Instead, he should contact his local or state bar association for the names of lawyers who might handle this type of case. Moreover, having already granted Cline a significant extension of the deadline for filing an objection to the Recommended Ruling, I am not of the view that an additional delay is warranted. Finally, the Court is not in a position to provide Cline with information about defendants in this case; he will have to seek that information himself. Thus, the pending motions on the docket (docs. 15, 16 & 17) are **denied**.

The Recommended Ruling of dismissal is approved and adopted with one clarification: The Complaint is dismissed without prejudice to Cline re-filing his claims no later than **September 28, 2015**. Should Cline wish to pursue the matter further, the Court recommends that Cline seek legal counsel to assist in the investigation of his complaint and in the re-drafting of the complaint that will state a valid cause of action.

It is so ordered.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 29th day of May 2015.

/s/ Stefan R. Underhill
Stefan R. Underhill
United States District Judge