

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

STANTON J. THOMPSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

LEE RYKER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 10-cv-436-JPG

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court for case management purposes. Plaintiff Stanton J. Thompson has filed two *pro se* motion (Docs. 47 & 48). Thompson is represented by counsel Theodore R. Bynum.

A defendant does not have a right to file his own motions when he is represented by counsel. *See Hayes v. Hawes*, 921 F.2d 100, 102 (7th Cir. 1990) (*per curiam*). “Representation by counsel and self-representation are mutually exclusive.” *Cain v. Peters*, 972 F.2d 748, 750 (7th Cir. 1992). So-called “hybrid representation” confuses and extends matters at trial and in other proceedings and, therefore, it is forbidden. *See United States v. Oreye*, 263 F.3d 669, 672-73 (7th Cir. 2001). The Court may strike as improper any such *pro se* motions. *See, e.g., United States v. Gwiazdzinski*, 141 F.3d 784, 787 (7th Cir. 1998). The Court **ORDERS** that Thompson’s motions (Docs. 47 & 48) be **STRICKEN**. The Court notes that this is not the first time Thompson has filed a *pro se* motion while represented by counsel. The Court **WARNS** Thompson that if he continues to make further *pro se* filings while he is represented by counsel, the Court will instruct the Clerk of Court to refuse to accept them for filing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: September 26, 2012

s/ J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
DISTRICT JUDGE