

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

SALEEM D. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER DIXON,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

**CASE NO:
7:21-cv-150-WLS-TQL**

ORDER

By Order (Doc. 125) entered November 12, 2024, Defendant was ordered to respond to *pro se* Plaintiff's Motion for New Trial; Altering Judgment (Doc. 124) ("New Trial Motion") by **Wednesday, November 27, 2024**. On November 15, 2024, Plaintiff's, Saleem D. Williams, Rule 60 Motion (Doc. 126) ("Rule 60 Motion") was filed.

On November 18, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal (Doc. 127) pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure appealing the Court's Judgment entered on September 30, 2024 (Doc. 123), which is the ruling from which Plaintiff seeks relief in the New Trial Motion and Rule to Motion. Also pending before the Court is Plaintiff's "Motion for Leave to Appeal Informa Pauper [*sic*]" (Doc. 129) ("IFP Motion") filed November 21, 2024. With the pending Rule 60 Motion and New Trial Motion, Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal appear to be premature.¹ To maintain control of its docket with respect to matters pending in this case, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. In addition to responding to Plaintiff's New Trial Motion, **on or before Wednesday, November 27, 2024**, counsel for Defendant Officer Dixon, shall file a response to the Rule 60 Motion (Doc. 126). Plaintiff may file a reply thereto no later than seven (7) days after Defendant's response is **filed**.

¹ "If a party files a notice of appeal after the court announces or enters a judgment—but before it disposes of [certain motions, including those filed under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59 and 60]—the notice becomes effective to appeal a judgment or order, in whole or in part, when the order disposing of the last such remaining motion is entered." Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(B)(i).

2. Except upon the filing of a written motion and entry of an order finding good cause, no further briefs shall be filed with respect to the Rule 60 Motion.

3. Plaintiff's IFP Motion (Doc. 129) is premature and, is therefore, **DENIED AS MOOT, WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**

SO ORDERED, this 22nd day of November 2024.

/s/ W. Louis Sands

W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT