

## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

<b>Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge</b>	Samuel Der-Yeghiayan	<b>Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge</b>	
<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	12 C 9141	<b>DATE</b>	1/17/2013
<b>CASE TITLE</b>	Diahann Grasty vs. Cambridge Integrated Services Group, Inc., et al.		

### DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

For the reasons stated below Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis [8] is denied. Based on all of the below, the instant action is dismissed. All pending dates and motions, if any, are hereby stricken as moot. Civil case terminated.

■ [ For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.

### STATEMENT

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff Diahann Grasty's (Grasty) motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. On December 14, 2012, the court denied Grasty's prior motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* because Grasty had not completed the *in forma pauperis* application form submitted to the court, and thus had failed to provide sufficient information concerning her financial status to show that her motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* should be granted. The court gave Grasty until January 11, 2013 to either pay the filing fee or file an accurately and properly completed *in forma pauperis* application form. The court also warned Grasty that if she failed to pay the filing fee or file an accurately and properly completed *in forma pauperis* application form by January 11, 2013, this case would be dismissed. On January 10, 2013, Grasty filed the instant motion. However, Grasty still has not properly completed the *in forma pauperis* application form, failing, for example, to provide the amount she received each month in salary or wages in her previous employment. Therefore, there is not sufficient information to properly adjudicate her request for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her motion is denied.

In addition, the Clerk of Court has informed the court that on January 11, 2013, Grasty attempted to file a *pro se* document entitled "COMPLAINT Continuation" at the Clerk's office. This court's chambers

## STATEMENT

was further advised by the Clerk's Office that the Clerk's Office employee at the counter who assisted Grasty told Grasty that when the Clerk's Office employee advised Grasty of a deficiency in the filing and that the filing did not comply with court rules, Grasty became confrontational with the Clerk's Office employee. During such confrontation, Grasty proceeded to use her cell phone to take the picture of the Clerk's Office employee, even though the use of cameras is prohibited in the court building. As a result of Grasty's conduct, a Courtroom Security Officer (CSO) was called. When the CSO questioned Grasty, Grasty lied about her taking the picture of the Clerk's Office employee. However, when the CSO inspected Grasty's cell phone, he discovered that the picture of the Clerk's Office employee had been saved on Grasty's phone. In the first instance, Grasty's confrontational conduct and challenging the court rules in the Clerk's Office shows that she is not willing to comply with court rules. In the second instance, Grasty lied to the CSO relating to her taking a photo of the Clerk's Office employee. Such conduct requires an appropriate sanction. Based on all of the above, the instant action is dismissed.