

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

ALFRED BARR,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO: 8:10-cv-430-T-23EAJ

DAVID GEE, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

The pro se plaintiff's "April 23, 2010, order inquiry" (Doc. 48) is construed as a motion for clarification of the April 23, 2010, order and **DENIED**. A court may not provide legal advice to a pro se party.* The April 15, 2010, order to show cause (Doc. 36) is **DISCHARGED**, and the plaintiff need not respond to the order to show cause. However, the plaintiff must submit an amended complaint in accord with the April 23, 2010, order (Doc. 45) dismissing the initial complaint. Failure to submit an amended complaint will result in dismissal of this action without further notice.

ORDERED in Tampa, Florida, on May 3, 2010.



STEVEN D. MERRYDAY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

* See GJR Investments, Inc. v. County of Escambia, Fla., 132 F.3d 1359, 1369 (11th Cir. 1998) ("Courts do and should show a leniency to pro se litigants not enjoyed by those with the benefit of a legal education. Yet even in the case of pro se litigants this leniency does not give a court license to serve as de facto counsel for a party or to rewrite an otherwise deficient pleading in order to sustain an action." (citations omitted)).