

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

JEROME RIDDICK,  
Plaintiff,

v.

SCOTT SEMPLE, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 3:17-cv-00134 (SRU)

**ORDER**

Jerome Riddick, *pro se*, initiated the present lawsuit with a complaint filed January 30, 2017. Doc. No. 1. The claims raised and the defendants named by that complaint are exactly identical to those raised and named in an earlier case, *Riddick v. Semple*, 3:17-cv-00120 (SRU).

“As part of its general power to administer its docket, a district court may stay or dismiss a suit that is duplicative of another federal court suit.” *Curtis v. Citibank, N.A.*, 226 F.3d 133, 138 (2d Cir. 2000). I need not apply any “rigid test” when deciding whether to dismiss a duplicative complaint, but instead must “consider the equities of the situation when exercising [my] discretion.” *Id.* Ultimately, “[t]he power to dismiss a duplicative lawsuit is meant to foster judicial economy and the ‘comprehensive disposition of litigation.’” *Id.* (quoting *Kerotest Mfg. Co. v. C-O-Two Fire Equip. Co.*, 342 U.S. 180, 183 (1952)).

Both of the cases at issue are newly filed, and neither has even seen the appearance of any defendant. Riddick, who has “no right to maintain two actions on the same subject, in the same court, against the same defendant[s] at the same time,” will not be prejudiced by dismissal of the duplicative complaint. *Id.* at 139. Therefore, I dismiss the complaint in the present case.

The Clerk shall terminate the file and close the case.

So ordered.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 27th day of February 2017.

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