

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION**

<b>BILLIE JEAN VERDI,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Petitioner,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:12-CV-488(MTT)</b>
	)	
<b>WILKINSON COUNTY, GEORGIA,</b>	)	
<b>JOHN W. ROBERTS, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	
	)	

---

**ORDER**

Before the Court are Petitioner Billie Jean Verdi’s Motion Before the Court and Motion for Review of Civil Action. (Docs. 17 and 18). The Court’s January 9, 2013, Order dismissed the Petitioner’s Petition without prejudice for failing “to state an arguable basis in law or fact for the relief it seeks.” (Doc. 8). The Petitioner moved to restate on January 17, 2013 (Doc. 11), and the Court found that the Petitioner’s Motion to Restate did not change the Court’s previous analysis of her Petition (Doc. 12). The Petitioner moved again to amend/restate her civil case (Doc. 13) and for reconsideration of the Court’s Order dismissing her case (Doc. 14). The Court denied both motions. (Doc. 15).

The Petitioner now moves the Court again to amend her Petition.<sup>1</sup> (Doc. 17). The Petitioner also requests that the Court review the civil action and reinstate the Petition. (Doc. 18). Both Motions are **DENIED**. The Petitioner still fails the state a

---

<sup>1</sup> Though styled as a “Motion Before the Court,” the contents of the Motion request that the Court permit the Petitioner to amend her Petition. Therefore, the Court will construe the Motion as a third Motion to Amend/Restate.

legally cognizable claim and her case has been dismissed. There is nothing to amend.

In any event, nothing in the Petitioner's Motions alters the Court's previous analysis.

**SO ORDERED**, this 11th day of March, 2013.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT