

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
VALDOSTA DIVISION

CINDY JOHNSON,

:

Plaintiff,

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

v.

Case No. 7:09-CV-90 (HL)

AMBLING COMPANIES,

Defendant.

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File Renewed Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Doc. 7) (the “Renewed IFP Motion”) and Plaintiff’s Motion to Vacate Order to Dismiss and Reinstate Complaint (Doc. 8) (the “Motion to Vacate”).

Plaintiff filed her Motion to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Doc. 1) (the “IFP Motion”) and Complaint (Doc. 2) on July 14, 2009. On July 15, 2009, this Court entered an Order (Doc. 3) instructing the Plaintiff to complete and file the “Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs” form (an “Application”) by August 4, 2009. Rather than comply with this Court’s instructions, though, on August 10 the Plaintiff filed an Affidavit (Doc. 4) in support her IFP Motion. Because the Plaintiff failed to comply with the Court’s order, this Court entered an Order (Doc. 5) and Judgment (Doc. 6) dismissing the Plaintiff’s case without prejudice.

On August 18, the Plaintiff filed her Renewed IFP Motion. She did not file an Application to support her Renewed IFP Motion. On August 24, the Plaintiff filed her Motion to Vacate.

After filing the above motions, the Plaintiff filed yet another lawsuit, Case Number 7:09-CV-124, with this Court on October 14, 2009. This lawsuit was identical to this lawsuit. In the subsequent lawsuit, the Plaintiff filed another motion to proceed in forma pauperis along with her complaint. On October 15, this Court denied the Plaintiff's in forma pauperis motion and gave the Plaintiff until October 28 to file an Application. When the Plaintiff failed to do this, this Court dismissed the Plaintiff's case without prejudice.

This Court has provided the Plaintiff plenty of opportunities to file her IFP Motion correctly, and yet the Plaintiff still has not filed an Application in support of her IFP Motion. Accordingly, the Renewed IFP Motion (Doc. 7) and the Motion to Vacate (Doc. 8) are denied.

**SO ORDERED**, this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2010.

***s/ Hugh Lawson***  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HUGH LAWSON, Senior Judge

jch