

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

MADELAINE SATTLEFIELD,

Plaintiff,

No. 16-1003-DRH

vs.

**OFFICE OF PERSONNEL
MANAGEMENT, GLORIA SILVER
MATHEW MCISAAC, and KARIN
BUCKHALTOR,**

Defendants.

ORDER

HERNDON, District Judge:

On September 2, 2106, Madelaine Sattlefied filed a pro se civil rights suit against the United States Office of Personel [sic] Management (Doc. 1). Along with her complaint, she filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, a motion for recruitment of counsel and a motion for service of process at government expense (Docs. 2, 3 & 4). On September 19, 2016, the Court denied with leave to refile plaintiff's motions and directed her to file an amended complaint detailing facts as to her claims (Doc. 5). On October 7, 2016, ignoring the Court's directive to her, the plaintiff filed an amended complaint adding Gloria Silver, Mathew McIsaac and Karin Buckhaltor as defendants (Doc. 6) but not clarifying what her

lawsuit is about. The Court notes that plaintiff did not separately renew her motions to proceed without prepaying fees and costs, recruitment of counsel and for service at government expense. However, the Court construes the amended complaint as containing renewed motions to proceed without prepaying fees and for service at the government expense. The Court *does not construe* the amended complaint as containing the motion for recruitment of counsel as the amended complaint does not contain any allegations of her efforts to find a lawyer.

Under the PLRA, the Court must screen any indigent's complaint (those filed by prisoners and non-prisoners alike) and dismiss the complaint if (a) the allegation of poverty is untrue, (b) the action is frivolous or malicious, (c) the action fails to state a claim upon which can be granted, or (d) the action seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

Again, the Court finds that Sattelfield's pleadings fall short of what is required and that that her motion does not survive § 1915(e)(2) review. As with the previous complaint, the Court cannot determine precisely what Sattelfield's claims are against the United States Office of Personnel and the individual defendants. Her amended complaint is "light" on the details. She does not describe with any detail the "who, what, when and how" of her cause of action to put defendants on notice of the allegations against them.

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice Sattelfield's motions to proceed in forma pauperis and for service at government expense. The Court

ALLOWS Sattlefield up to and including November 17, 2016 to file another amended complaint that provides details of the facts of her claims against defendants. Failure to comply with this Order may result in the Court dismissing her case for failure to prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 17th day of October, 2016.

David R. Herndon
Digitally signed
by Judge David
R. Herndon
Date: 2016.10.17
13:37:51 -05'00'

United States District Judge