

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

**DAVID ROBERT BENTZ,  
#S03210,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**WILLIAM QUALLS, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**Case No. 18-cv-01064-SPM**

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

**MCGLYNN, District Judge:**

This matter is before the Court on the “Notice of Contempt of Court” filed by Plaintiff Bentz. (Doc. 73). Bentz alleges that he is being denied use of the law library and e-filing system at Menard Correctional Center. As a result, he has been forced to mail his court documents using the United States Postal Service. Bentz also claims he is not receiving most Notice of Electronic Filings (“NEFs”) and is receiving court deadline notices after the deadlines have passed. He asks the Court to impose sanctions upon Defendants and/or the Warden of Menard and Menard Correctional Center. Defendants have filed a response in opposition. (Doc. 76).

Because Bentz has failed to adhere to instructions given by the judges in this district to provide full details of his allegations when filing motions and to refrain from filing duplicative documents in multiple cases, the request for sanctions is denied. As Defendants point out in their response, Bentz has repeatedly been instructed to “provide something more than generalize assertions...[and] to include concrete facts and details” when filing motions and pleadings with the Court. *See Bentz v. Threadgille*, No. 17-cv-01384 (Docs. 86, 100). *See also Bentz v. Atchinson*, No. 14-cv-001132 (Doc. 105) (denying two motions for contempt because Bentz failed “to specifically identify any documents that were not actually filed”); *Bentz v. Hughs*, No. 13-cv-

01280 (Doc. 105) (noting that Bentz’s reasons for requesting copies of a transcript were “vague”); *Bentz v. Qualls*, No. 14-cv-00562 (Doc. 50) (stating that Bentz’s “generalized allegation of harassment and threats is insufficient to justify issuance of a preliminary injunction”); *Bentz v. Lindenberg*, No. 15-cv-00121 (Doc. 118) (denying motions for contempt for failing to indicate what documents have not been filed with the court or how he has been prejudiced); *Bentz v. Maue*, 16-cv-00854 (Doc. 200) (denying motion for status for failure to provide anything more than general assertions). He has also been warned to refrain from filing the same motions in multiple cases, as it “wastes judicial resources and creates a risk of inconsistent opinions at the district court level.” *Bentz v. Lindenberg*, No. 18-cv-00016 (Doc. 13). *See also Bentz v. Maue*, No. 16-cv- 00854 (Docs. 43, 50, 52, 251). Bentz has disregarded these instructions. He filed the Notice of Contempt in this case and six others and fails to provide “concrete facts” regarding his allegations and how they relate to *this case*. Therefore, the request for sanctions is **DENIED**. The Motion to Dismiss for Sanctions filed by Defendants remains pending. (Doc. 72).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: May 11, 2021**

*s/Stephen P. McGlynn*  
**STEPHEN P. MCGLYNN**  
**United States District Judge**