

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
WAYCROSS DIVISION**

SAEED ISHMAEL NURIDEEN, :

Plaintiff, :

v. :

CIVIL ACTION NO.: CV514-041

WARE STATE PRISON MEDICAL :  
DEPARTMENT; WARDEN, WARE :  
STATE PRISON; FNU HART; ROBERT :  
TOOLE; GLEN JOHNSON; J. RECTOR; :  
J. JANIKOWSKI; DR. FERRELL (male); :  
DR. FERRELL (female); DR. TESFAYE; :  
MS. BRADY; and MS. McCRAY, :

Defendants. :

**ORDER**

Plaintiff filed a Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 contesting certain conditions of his confinement at Ware State Prison in Waycross, Georgia, and he named the "Ware State Prison Medical Department" and "Ware State Prison Warden" as the Defendants. The undersigned conducted a frivolity review of Plaintiff's Complaint and recommended that the Complaint be dismissed because Plaintiff failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. In response, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Amend his Complaint, which the undersigned granted, and an Amended Complaint. In the Order which granted Plaintiff's Motion to Amend his Complaint, the undersigned directed the Clerk of Court to add several individuals as named Defendants. (Doc. No. 15). Plaintiff also filed a Motion to Exclude Certain Portions of his Original Complaint, which the undersigned granted.

After review of his Amended Complaint, the undersigned informed Plaintiff that his claims were unrelated and directed Plaintiff to advise the Court of which claims from a specific date he wishes to pursue in this cause of action. Plaintiff also was advised that his failure to file a proper response to the undersigned's Order could result in the dismissal of his entire cause of action. Plaintiff further was advised that, once he files a response to this Order, the requisite frivolity review of his claims would occur. (Doc. No. 23).

In response to the undersigned's directives, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to Include Conspiracy Ground to Complaint, a Motion to Preserve Jury Trial, and a Motion for Leave of Joinder of Claims. Plaintiff's Motions, (doc. nos. 24, 25, 27), are **GRANTED**, but only to the extent the contentions contained in these Motions will be considered during the frivolity review of Plaintiff's claims.

Plaintiff is once again advised that his claims are unrelated. FED. R. CIV. P. 20(a). Plaintiff also is once again directed to advise the Court of which allegations he wishes to pursue in this cause of action, i.e., events stemming from events occurring on: May 14, 2011; March 26, 2012; April 19, 2013; or March 19, 2014, within twenty (20) days of this Order. Plaintiff also is advised, yet again, that his failure to respond to this Order and its directives in a proper manner may result in the dismissal of his entire cause of action.

**SO ORDERED**, this 30<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2015.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES E. GRAHAM  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE