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

DOUGLAS M. THIGPEN,)		
Petitioner,)		
v. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No.	12 C 1642 (03 CR 1084)
onitial strille of maliticity)		
Respondent.)		

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Douglas Thigpen ("Thigpen") has just submitted a partly typed, partly hand-printed document that he has captioned "Claim for Return of Property, and Motion To Render Property to Power of Attorney." Although that self-prepared document states that the filing was made "pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C.S. \$1738 of the Federal Civil Procedure," that statute clearly has no relevance to Thigpen's stated purpose of obtaining the return of certain property that was assertedly taken from him at the time of his arrest more than eight years ago (he lists the date as November 13, 2003). But in any event, Thigpen goes on to state that he is in the process of using the Freedom of Information Act to "determin[e] the actual whereabouts of the property," and the only request that he has made is that his motion be filed "and that the proceedings be stayed until further notice" (emphasis in original).

Under those circumstances, because there are no "proceedings" of any nature before this Court, so that there is

nothing to be stayed, it is pointless for the Clerk's Office to have opened a civil case number for Thigpen's claim. This action (if it can be termed an action at all) is therefore ordered dismissed, without prejudice of course to the possibility that some related matter may arise in the future that <u>is</u> within this Court's jurisdiction.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Date: March 9, 2012