IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA AUGUSTA DIVISION

JULIAN E. ROCHESTER,

*

Petitioner,

v.

CV 112-184

*T.W. THRASH, B. OBAMA, ET AL., *

*

Respondents.

ORDER

Presently pending before the Court are Petitioner's motions to set aside judgment, to appoint counsel, and for writ of mandamus to compel the Clerk of Court to docket a purported habeas petition that Petitioner filed in February. (Doc. nos. 24 and 27.) To the extent Petitioner's motions are decipherable, they merely repeat the fantastic allegations of a "nation wide [sic] conspiracy" involving the President of the United States, a number of federal judges, a United States Attorney, and United States Marshalls to limit his access to the courts. (Doc. no. 27, pp. 1, 3, 8, 9.) Further, Petitioner again recites that he was "kidnapped" from Augusta, Georgia by "SCDC," and requests that the Court "save his life by med[ical] care . . . once removed from his kidnappers." (Id. at p. 7.)1

The Court acknowledges that Petitioner was adjudged mentally ill by order of the Darlington County, South Carolina Probate Court on December 17, 2010 (Doc. 27, p. 2) and that Petitioner asserts he was "beaten 251 times" and is "suffering and [] dying from lack of med[ical] cares [sic]" (Id. at p. 3). To the extent Petitioner seeks to base any claim for relief on these

Upon due consideration and for the reasons stated in the Court's Order adopting the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. no. 11) and first Order denying Petitioner's motion to set aside judgment (Doc. no. 14), all Petitioner's motions are hereby DENIED.

ORDER ENTERED at Augusta, Georgia, this _____ day of September, 2014.

HONORABLE J. RANDAL HALL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

conclusory allegations, his claim falls well short of establishing "imminent danger of serious physical injury" in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

See Skillern v. Jackson, No. CV606-49, 2006 WL 1687752, at *2 (S.D. Ga. June 14, 2006) (citing Brown v. Johnson, 387 F.3d 1344, 1349-50 (11th Cir. 2004)); see also March 4, 2013 Order, Doc. 11, p. 3 (finding this Court lacks jurisdiction over Petitioner's habeas petition and that Petitioner may not seek non-habeas relief on account of repeated frivolity and failure to establish "imminent danger of serious physical injury").