Strickland v. Godinez et al Doc. 33

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

ERIK C. STRICKLAND,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Case No. 3:14-cv-962-NJR-DGW
S. A. GODINEZ, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

WILKERSON, Magistrate Judge:

Now pending before the Court are the Motion for Reconsideration (entitled "Objection to Magistrate's Denial for Plaintiff's Motion for Recruitment of Council [sic]") (Doc. 26), the Motion to Address the Court (Doc. 27), and the Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint (Doc. 28) filed by Plaintiff on October 27, 2014.

The Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**. Plaintiff represents that he received assistance in filing his Complaint from another inmate who was recently transferred from Lawrence Correctional Center on October 10, 2014, that the issues in this mater are complex, and that he only is allowed limited access to the law library. Plaintiff repeats that he has no legal training, that he will be required to conduct a number of depositions and that he will require expert witnesses. While the Court is mindful that Plaintiff has no legal training and that his incarceration will hamper his ability to prosecute this matter, his situation is no different from other inmates who are attempting to secure their civil rights. Plaintiff appears competent and able to ask for particular relief, he seems capable of researching issues and presenting case authority to the Court (without the assistance of another inmate), and appears capable of prosecuting this matter. If expert testimony is required and if Plaintiff will have substantial problems conducting discovery,

then the Court may reconsider recruiting counsel. However, at this stage of the litigation, in light

of Plaintiff's aptitude, counsel will not be recruited.

In Plaintiff's next Motion, to address the Court, Plaintiff discusses the pages missing from

his original complaint and the necessity of filing an amended complaint. Plaintiff also seeks leave

to file an amended complaint, received by the Court on October 28, 2014. Both Motions are

DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Currently pending before the Court is a Motion to

Reconsider an Order entered by Judge Rosenstengel screening Plaintiff's original Complaint (Doc.

8). Once that Motion is considered by the District Court, Plaintiff may refile his Motion to

Amend the Complaint if necessary. If Plaintiff refiles that Motion, it is unnecessary to resend the

proposed amended complaint, unless Plaintiff seeks to make any additions to the document

already provided to the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 31, 2014

DONALD G. WILKERSON

United States Magistrate Judge

Wonald Wilkerson

2