Hallett v. State Of Ohio et al Doc. 46

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA OCALA DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER EDWARD HALLETT,

Plaintiff,

v. Case No: 5:16-cv-238-Oc-32PRL

STATE OF OHIO, et al,

Defendants.

ORDER

Since filing this action less than three months ago, Plaintiff has filed fourteen motions, all of which remain pending. (Docs. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 26, 28, 30, 33, 37, 39, 41, 42, 43). In these motions, Plaintiff seeks a wide range of relief including entry of default and early discovery. Based on my recommendation that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint should be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Doc. 45), Plaintiff's motions are due to be **DENIED**. *See e.g.*, *Univ. of S. Alabama v. Am. Tobacco Co.*, 168 F.3d 405, 410 (11th Cir. 1999) ("[O]nce a federal court determines that it is without subject matter jurisdiction, the court is powerless to continue."). Likewise, the motions for extension of time to respond to the Amended Complaint filed by Defendants Elise Burkey, Esq. (Doc. 22) and Gary Rich, Esq. (Doc. 34) are due to be **DENIED**.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Ocala, Florida on June 9, 2016.

PHILIP R. LAMMENS

United States Magistrate Judge

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record Unrepresented Parties