

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
PADUCAH DIVISION
CASE NO.: 5:09-CV-00043-TBR**

CLAUDE R. COX

PLAINTIFF

v.

STEVE HILAND, MD, et al.

DEFENDANTS

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a motion for copies of “the 1983 law [suit] that was filed” and “all of the paperwork that was also filed.” DN 74. Defendant has filed no reply. Accordingly, this matter is ripe for adjudication.

“A prisoner/plaintiff bringing a civil action has no general constitutional right to free, unlimited photocopying services.” *Giles v. Tate*, 907 F.Supp 1135, 1137 (S.D. Ohio 1995) (citing *Sands v. Lewis*, 886 F.2d 1166, 1169 (9th Cir. 1989)). Rather, a plaintiff need only be provided with “a fundamental right of access to the courts.” As this Court has explained previously, a copy fee of 10 cents per page is assessed when copies are requested. Courts have generally found that a 10 cent copy fee allows for reasonable access to the courts. *Kendrick v. Bland*, 586 F.Supp 1536, 1553 (W.D.Ky. 1984); *Harrell v. Keohane*, 621 F.2d 1059, 1061 (10th Cir. 1980).

Additionally, Plaintiff has given no explanation as to why he needs such a substantial amount of copying done. Before this Court could grant free copies, it would need to determine that denial of such copies would limit “a fundamental right of access to the courts.” Without

some stated need for the copies, no right of access to the courts is denied. Accordingly, the Motion for Copies is DENIED.

The Clerk of Court is directed to send Plaintiff a copy of the docket sheet with this order. If Plaintiff wishes to pay for copies, he should indicated which docket numbers he would like to receive.

IT IS SO ORDERED.