

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

TYRONE HURT,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Docket no. 1:14-cv-518-GZS
)	
UNITED STATES MARSHAL SERVICE,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	

TYRONE HURT,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Docket no. 1:14-cv-519-GZS
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER DISMISSING CASES & IMPOSING FILING RESTRICTIONS

Before the Court in the two above-captioned cases are *pro se* Complaints, each containing requests within the body of the Complaint to proceed *in forma pauperis*. It appears both Complaints were mailed to this Court on December 1, 2014. Generously construing the inserts in the present Complaints (ECF No. 1) to contain a request to proceed *in forma pauperis* and assuming Plaintiff’s financial information is as represented in his previously filed application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 4 in D. Me. Docket # 1:14-cv-416-GZS), the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiff leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in these two actions (ECF No. 2).

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the Court is now required to DISMISS both of these actions. The Court readily finds that both illegible Complaints are frivolous and fail to state any cognizable claim. The Court also hereby certifies that any appeal from this dismissal would not be taken in good faith pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

The Court notes that with the filing of these two cases, Mr. Hurt has filed a total of sixteen cases in the District of Maine since August 2014. His first action, *Hurt v. Ferguson, Missouri, et al.* (D. Me. Docket # 1:14-cv-337-GZS), was filed on August 21, 2014 and subsequently dismissed for failure to state a claim. (See ECF Nos. 5 & 8 in D. Me. Docket # 1:14-cv-337-GZS.) His second action, *Hurt v. Boasberg, et al.* (D. Me. Docket # 1:14-cv-396-GZS), was filed on October 6, 2014 and named as defendants a federal judge, the United States Secret Service, and the D.C. City Council. In that case, a Recommended Decision found the complaint was likewise subject to dismissal after review in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The Court has since affirmed that Recommended Decision and dismissed Hurt's second case. See ECF No. 7 in D. Me. Docket # 1:14-cv-396-GZS. Likewise, the Court has summarily dismissed twelve other actions filed by Hurt. See D. Me. Docket #s 1:14-cv-416-GZS, 1:14-cv-461-GZS, 1:14-cv-463-GZS, 1:14-cv-464-GZS, 1:14-cv-465-GZS, 1:14-cv-466-GZS, 1:14-cv-484-GZS, 1:14-cv-498-GZS, 1:14-cv-499-GZS, 2:14-cv-501-GZS, 1:14-cv-502-GZS and 1:14-cv-503-GZS.

The Court gave its first *Cok* warning to Mr. Hurt in an order dated November 19, 2014. See ECF No. 2 in D. Me Docket # 1:14-cv-484-GZS. It reiterated that Order on November 24, 2014, stating in part: "the Court will not allow Mr. Hurt to continue filing complaints that are both illegible and frivolous and thereby waste both judicial time and resources within the District of Maine. If the Court receives another frivolous or illegible complaint after Mr. Hurt has received this Order and the Court's prior *Cok* warning, it will declare Mr. Hurt an abusive litigant and

impose filing restrictions.” November 24, 2014 Order of Dismissal (ECF No. 3 in D. Me Docket # 1:14-cv-499-GZS). It appears that Mr. Hurt mailed the two current Complaints after receiving these two prior warnings as well as multiple other orders clearly indicating that his prior filings with the Court were illegible and insufficient. However, a quick review of the present Complaints shows that Mr. Hurt has made no effort to improve his filings and continues to simply mail papers to this Court that state no cognizable claim. These filings appear designed to simply waste the Court’s time and resources and thereby delay the administration of justice in other cases. Therefore, the Court finds Mr. Hurt to be an abusive litigant within the District of Maine and hereby ENJOINS Tyrone Hurt from commencing any action in the District of Maine without prior leave of the Court.

The Clerk is directed to refuse to file or docket any paper or pleading it receives from Mr. Hurt that purports to be a new Complaint without a prior order of the Court. Mr. Hurt may file one notice of appeal in any of his existing cases. However, the Court has already determined that such appeals are not taken in good faith and, by allowing notices of appeal to be filed on the docket, the Court is not changing that prior determination. Any other mailing received from Mr. Hurt that does not contain a separate, clearly legible motion seeking leave to file shall be returned to Mr. Hurt without any further order or action by the Court. Mr. Hurt is instructed that repeated failure to comply with this Order’s filing restrictions may result in the Court imposing additional sanctions.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ George Z. Singal
United States District Judge

Dated this 9th day of December, 2014.