Peterson v. Dart et al Doc. 6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

RICHARD PETERSON #20090007816,)

Plaintiff,)

v.) No. 10 C 5681

THOMAS DART, et al.,)

Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Richard Peterson ("Peterson") has filed a self-prepared 42 U.S.C. §1983 Complaint against Sheriff Thomas Dart, Executive Director of the Cook County Department of Corrections ("County Jail") Salvador Godinez and an unidentified "John Doe" dentist at the County Jail. This memorandum order is issued based on this Court's 28 U.S.C. §1915A¹ screening of Peterson's Complaint.

Although Peterson has accompanied the Complaint with a filled-out In Forma Pauperis Application ("Application") and a filled-out Motion for Appointment of Counsel ("Motion"), this Court cannot now address the threshold issue of in forma pauperis status because the County Jail printout that accompanies the Application does not cover the appropriate time period—it begins in early 2009 and ends with June 8, 2010, although the proper period required to comply with Section 1915(a)(2) is the six—

All further references to Title 28's provisions will simply take the form "Section--."

month period from March 1 through August 31, 2010.2

Accordingly this Court will hold Peterson's Complaint and this action, as well as the Application and the Motion, in abeyance until it receives a proper printout of his trust fund account. To that end this Court is transmitting copies of this memorandum order not only to Peterson, but also directly to the County Jail fiscal officer B. Carey, the latter with a request that the institution send a copy of the necessary printout (with Peterson's name and this Case No. 10 C 5681 noted on the document) to:

Chambers of Honorable Milton I. Shadur United States District Court 219 South Dearborn Street #2388 Chicago IL 60604

Peterson should understand, however, that he is also responsible for taking whatever steps are needed to assure delivery of the printout.³

Milton I. Shadur Senior United States District Judge

Date: September 14, 2010

² For that purpose this Court credits Peterson's August 31 dating of the Complaint, to give effect to the "mailbox rule" even though his documents were received in the Clerk's Office on September 7.

 $^{^{\}scriptscriptstyle 3}$ No view is expressed here as to the merits of Peterson's Complaint.