

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

<b>PAUL WROBEL,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>2:21-cv-00123-JDL</b>
	)	
<b>UNITED STATES, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ORDER ACCEPTING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND COK WARNING**

Plaintiff Paul Wrobel, who is self-represented, filed his Complaint against the United States and the United States Attorney General, asserting various claims based on the alleged actions of federal officials (ECF No. 1). Wrobel filed a Motion for Service on July 28, 2021 (ECF No. 6). United States Magistrate Judge John C. Nivison filed his Recommended Decision on the Complaint on August 3, 2021 (ECF No. 7), pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 636(b)(1)(B) (West 2021) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Additionally, Judge Nivison issued an Order denying Wrobel’s Motion for Service on August 3, 2021 (ECF No. 8). Wrobel filed an Objection to the Recommended Decision on August 23, 2021 (ECF No. 9).

I have reviewed and considered the Recommended Decision, together with the entire record and have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge. I concur with the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his recommended decision and determine that no further proceedings are necessary.

This is the fourth complaint that Wrobel has filed in this Court in the last twelve months, all of which made the same meritless claims against a variety of state and federal elected officials. *See* Compl., *Wrobel v. Maine*, No. 1:20-cv-00430-JDL (D. Me. Nov. 16, 2020), ECF No. 1; Compl., *Wrobel v. Maine*, No. 1:20-cv-00425-JDL (D. Me. Nov. 12, 2020), ECF No. 1; Compl., *Wrobel v. Maine*, No. 1:21-cv-00028-JDL (D. Me. Jan. 21, 2021), ECF No. 1 (*Cok* warning issued August 31, 2021, ECF No. 16). Wrobel's claims do not have a legal basis, and his pleadings and filings in this case, as well as the two he commenced in November 2020 and the case he commenced in January 2021, are frivolous.

Although Wrobel is representing himself, he may not submit “[g]roundless and inappropriate filings” to the Court. *D’Amario v. United States*, 251 F.R.D. 63, 64 (D. Me. 2008). “[F]rivolous filings waste judicial resources” and inhibit the resolution of substantial matters. *Adams v. Adams*, No. 1:17-cv-00200-GZS, 2019 WL 2814627, at \*1 (D. Me. July 2, 2019).

In light of Wrobel's repeated frivolous filings, the Court once again hereby issues a *Cok* warning: **Any further frivolous filings by Wrobel, in this docket or in a new case, may result in an immediate Order restricting his ability to file documents with the Court.** *See Cok v. Fam. Ct. of R.I.*, 985 F.2d 32, 35-36 (1st Cir. 1993). Those restrictions may include: requiring Wrobel to append an affidavit to future pleadings stating that the pleadings do not raise the same issues that this Court has previously dismissed, as well as a concise summary of the claim(s); limiting his ability to file documents within a new action without Court approval; limiting the

number and length of Wrobel's filings; and other restrictions to screen out frivolous filings. See *United States v. Gomez-Rosario*, 418 F.3d 90, 101 (1st Cir. 2005) (noting that federal courts may "enjoin a party—even a *pro se* party—from filing frivolous and vexatious motions); *Procup v. Strickland*, 792 F.2d 1069, 1072-73 (11th Cir. 1986) (listing illustrative restrictions).

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 7) of the Magistrate Judge is **ACCEPTED**. Wrobel's Complaint (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

**Dated: September 16, 2021.**

/s/ JON D. LEVY  
**CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE**