

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

BENNIE K. ELLISON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 13-cv-453-SMY
)	
MARC HODGE,)	
VAUGHN,)	
MUSGRAVE,)	
and PROPERTY DEPARTMENT,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

YANDLE, District Judge:

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Bennie Ellison’s Request for Relief (Doc. 10) from the Order restricting his filings in this district (Doc. 9). Pursuant to the challenged Order, Plaintiff “is restricted from filing any new civil actions in this Court until such time as his outstanding filing fees in this district have been paid in full” (Doc. 9, p. 2). The Order also provides an avenue for relief – allowing Plaintiff to file a motion with the Court no sooner than February 18, 2016 seeking modification or rescission of the filing ban. Plaintiff’s Request for Relief was filed in accord with this provision.

Plaintiff indicates that the filing ban should be lifted because of IDOC’s fraud. Specifically, Plaintiff claims that officials at Pinckneyville Correctional Center and/or Hill Correctional Center are deducting court fees from his account too frequently. He also complains that officials have failed to provide him with copies of transactions from his trust fund account or accounts for 2016 and 2017.

Plaintiff's arguments do not warrant rescinding or modifying the filing ban. Plaintiff does not contend that he has paid his fees in full or that officials are somehow preventing him from paying his fees. Rather, he complains that officials are sending payments too frequently and/or have not provided him with certain documentation. These arguments do not alter the fact that, according to the Court's records, Plaintiff still owes the following fees:

- Case No. 13-cv-453 (\$360.92)
- Case No. 13-cv-1185 (\$288.12)
- Case No. 13-cv-1185 (Appellate Fees \$452.67)
- Case No. 14-cv-581 (Appellate Fees \$366.49)

The Court will not investigate or referee any quarrels Plaintiff has with Pinckneyville Correctional Center or Hill Correctional Center about their procedures, and only allowed Plaintiff's Request for Relief to be filed to determine whether he had satisfied his fee obligations. He has not and he presents no other argument warranting lifting the filing ban.

Accordingly, the Request for Relief (Doc. 10) is **DENIED** and the filing ban remains in place. Further, the Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to provide Plaintiff with copies of his payment history in Case Nos. 13-cv-453, 13-cv-1185, and 14-cv-581.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 16, 2020

s/ STACIM. YANDLE
United States District Judge