

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

**JUSTIN HUGHES MERRITT (#3452)**

**CIVIL ACTION**

**VERSUS**

**DR. SOON, ET AL.**

**NO. 11-0284-JJB-DLD**

**ORDER**

On or about April 27, 2011, the pro se plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at the Feliciana Forensic Facility, Jackson, Louisiana, filed this proceeding pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In his original Complaint form, the plaintiff attempted to commence two (2) separate civil actions, the first against Dr. Soon. Dr. Veaze Synka, Mr. Ashley Smith, Mrs. Elizebeth, Dr. Anoconna and the doctors and social workers employed at the Feliciana Forensic Facility, and the second against the State of Louisiana. In the former, the plaintiff complains that personnel at the Feliciana Forensic Facility have prevented him from communicating with law enforcement officials in order to confess to past crimes he has allegedly committed, and in the latter, he and a purported co-plaintiff, Jeff Smirly, seek to attack the constitutionality of the Louisiana marriage laws which prevent him and his co-plaintiff from entering into a same-sex marriage.

By correspondence dated May 26, 2011, the Court directed the plaintiff to resubmit his Complaint form within twenty-one (21) days, correctly identifying the parties where appropriate on the Court's form, and advised him that he could not commence two separate civil actions utilizing a single Complaint form. Rec.doc.no. 4. In addition, the Court advised the plaintiff that both he and his purported co-plaintiff were required to sign the Complaint and that both were required to either pay the full amount of the Court's filing fee or, within twenty-one (21) days, submit properly completed motions to proceed in forma pauperis, together with Statements of Account certifying to the average six-month deposits and balance in their inmate account(s). Id. Finally, the plaintiff was specifically advised that a, "failure to amend the pleadings as indicated will result in the

dismissal of your suit by the court without further notice.” Id.

A review of the record by the Court now reflects that the plaintiff has failed to comply with the Court’s directives. Accordingly, it is appropriate that the plaintiff’s action be dismissed as a result of his failure to correct the deficiencies of which he was notified. Therefore,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the above-captioned proceeding be dismissed, without prejudice, as a result of the plaintiff’s failure to correct the deficiencies of which he was notified. Judgment shall be entered accordingly.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, this 20<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**JAMES J. BRADY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**