

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
OCALA DIVISION**

RANDALL LAMONT ROLLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 5:18-cv-8-Oc-30PRL

SHERRI WEST, EMILLY GLENN,
MICHAEL MACNAMARA, KEVIN
CARROLL, JAMES SHELFER, JOHN
CAMPBELL, and CITY OF
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA,

Defendants.

RANDALL LAMONT ROLLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 5:18-cv-13-Oc-30PRL

RODERICK ROBINSON, DEMETRIS
TAYLOR, STACEY SHARPE, THOMAS
GANO, GEORGIA CHAPPLEMAN,
MARTIN FITZPATRICK, and CITY OF
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA,

Defendants.

RANDALL LAMONT ROLLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 5:18-cv-18-Oc-30PRL

JAMES SHELFER, EMILLY GLENN,
SHERRI WEST, LACEY KANTOR, JOHN
CAMPBELL, MARTIN FITZPATRICK, and

CITY OF TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA,

Defendants.

RANDALL LAMONT ROLLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 5:18-cv-25-Oc-30PRL

CITY OF TALLAHASSEE, OWEN
MCCAUL, JAMES HANKINSON, M.
LILJA DANDELAKA, JOHN MACELUCH,
RICHARD HOOD, DAVID COLLINS,
THOMAS BATEMAN, JAMES WOLF,
SCOTT MAKER and STEPHANIE RAY,

Defendants.

RANDALL LAMONT ROLLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 5:18-cv-45-Oc-30PRL

CITY OF TALLAHASSEE, OWEN
MCCAUL, THOMAS BATEMAN,
KENNETH DAVID, FRANK SHEFFIELD,
ADAM RUIZ and DAVID COLLINS,

Defendants.

RANDALL ROLLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 5:18-cv-46-Oc-30PRL

CHARLES PERRY, SAM BRUCE, RANDY
FRAZEY, MIKE RAGAN, MARTY WEST,

MIKE WOMBLE and CITY OF
TALLAHASSEE,

Defendants.

OMNIBUS ORDER

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court the Report and Recommendations submitted by Magistrate Judge Philip R. Lammens on Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis* in these six cases. In all of the cases, Plaintiff Randall Rolle has brought suit against persons involved in his 2002 state court conviction and subsequent probation violation proceedings—including prosecutors, judges, and law enforcement officers. His claims have repeatedly been dismissed as frivolous, and this Court has previously imposed sanctions against Plaintiff. *See Rolle v. City of Tallahassee, et al.*, No. 5:15-cv-462-Oc-30PRL, Doc. 9 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 8, 2015).

Despite the previous dismissals and sanctions, Rolle has continued to bring the same and similar frivolous claims, always seeking to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Magistrate Judge determined that each of the lawsuits Plaintiff filed in his most recent barrage are frivolous. The Magistrate Judge also recommends that this Court revoke Plaintiff's IFP privileges prospectively—a sanction that was imposed on Plaintiff in the Northern District of Florida, where he files similar lawsuits. *See Rolle v. Dilmore, et al.*, No. 4:16-cv-425-RH-GRJ (N.D. Fla. May 23, 2017).


Plaintiff has objected to the R&Rs, arguing the Magistrate Judge misapplied the law and misconstrued the facts. After reviewing the objections, the Court determines they all lack merit. So the Court concludes, after careful consideration of the Report and Recommendation

of the Magistrate Judge in conjunction with an independent examination of the file, the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations should be adopted, confirmed, and approved in all respects.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that:

1. The Report and Recommendations¹ of the Magistrate Judge are adopted, confirmed, and approved in all respects and are made a part of this omnibus order for all purposes, including appellate review.
2. Plaintiff Randall Rolle's Motions to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis*² are DENIED.
3. The Clerk is directed to close the following cases: 5:18-cv-8; 5:18-cv-13; 5:18-cv-18; 5:18-cv-25; 5:18-cv-45; and 5:18-cv-46.
4. The Court further orders that Plaintiff Randall Rolle's IFP privilege is REVOKED, and the Clerk is directed to refuse to accept any more of Plaintiff's filings relating to his 2002 state court conviction and subsequent probation violation proceedings that are not accompanied by full payment of the appropriate filing fee.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Tampa, Florida, this 26th day of March, 2018.



JAMES S. MOODY, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:
Counsel/Parties of Record

¹ The R&Rs are as follows: 5:18-cv-8, Doc. 8; 5:18-cv-13, Doc. 9; 5:18-cv-18, Doc. 8; 5:18-cv-25, Doc. 7; 5:18-cv-45, Doc. 3; and 5:18-cv-46, Doc. 4.

² The Motions to Proceed *in Forma Pauperis* are as follows: 5:18-cv-8, Doc. 2; 5:18-cv-13, Doc. 2; 5:18-cv-18, Doc. 2; 5:18-cv-25, Doc. 2; 5:18-cv-45, Doc. 2; and 5:18-cv-46, Doc. 2.