

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

SEYON HAYWOOD,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 14-cv-01027-JPG-DGW
)	
S A GODINEZ, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
_____)	Consolidated with:
)	
LAMONT NORWOOD,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 15-cv-00035-JPG-PMF
)	
S A GODINEZ, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the Plaintiff Seyon Haywood's Motion to Allow Objections to become part of the record even though Plaintiff is represented by Counsel (Doc. 83-1). The Plaintiff filed this motion *pro se* although he is represented by counsel in connection with this matter. Plaintiff states that he has had no contact with his counsel in almost 60 days; that he has received no response to correspondence sent to his attorney; and that he has not had any telephonic communication with his counsel.

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*); *United States v. Oreye*, 263 F.3d 669, 672-73 (7th Cir. 2001). As such, Plaintiff Seyon Haywood's Motion to Allow Objections to become part of the record even though Plaintiff is represented by Counsel

(Doc. 83-1) is **DENIED** and Plaintiff's Objection (Doc. 83) to the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 78) is **STRICKEN**.

However, the Court is concerned with the lack of contact between the Plaintiff and his counsel with regard to the Report and Recommendation and whether an objection should be filed.

As such, the Court is **GRANTING** additional time for Plaintiff to file an objection, if any, to the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 78). Plaintiff's Objection, if any, is due on or before **June 1, 2015**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/15/2015

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