

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

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------|
| LISA F. WALLACE, etc., et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiffs, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No. 10 C 6317 |
| |) | |
| DEBORRAH LINDI LEITCH, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

MEMORANDUM ORDER

On October 4, 2010 this Court issued a brief memorandum opinion and order ("Opinion") that addressed what it characterized as "a sprawling and disjointed handwritten Complaint (coupled with bulky exhibits) that plainly has no business in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois" and found it frivolous in the legal sense, as well as its being geographically misplaced (as the Opinion reflected, all the named defendants reside in Oklahoma, with no basis suggested for exercising in personam jurisdiction and haling them into court here in Illinois). That determination called for dismissal of the Complaint and this action, and the Opinion so ordered.

Nothing daunted, an Oklahoma personage whose letterhead identifies his as "Stephen P. Wallace, Independent U.S. Senate Candidate 2008 & 2010" ("Wallace," who was listed in the original Complaint as the "private attorney general" for the first named plaintiffs) has directed an 11-page scattershot communication

(together with no fewer than 29 exhibits) to Chief Judge James Holderman of this District Court.¹ Wallace has also included as Ex. 29 a document bearing the caption of this case, labeled "Motion To Vacate Judgement [sic] Pursuant F.R.C.P. Rule 60(b)(1),"² signed by him as "Private Attorney General" and reading in its entirety:

Comes now Plaintiffs who move this Court to Vacate the October 1, 2010 [sic] ORDERS for Good Cause Shown and in an Abundance [sic] of Caution.

That most recent submission reinforces the action that this Court took on October 4. It should perhaps be said that no inference should be drawn in either direction as to whether one or more of the plaintiffs named in the Complaint may have some claim against one or more of the named defendants, capable of being pursued in some other forum. But in terms of this lawsuit, what was said before still goes, and the current motion is denied.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: October 14, 2010

¹ Wallace's cover letter to Chief Judge Holderman reads:

Please try to RESOLVE this before it gets out of hand - the Audit will restore \$ to the US & rectify the previous wrongs. Thank you.

² Because of the timing of Wallace's submission, his motion is treated as having been filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. ("Rule") 59(e) rather than Rule 60(b)(1).