UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ROGER SEDLAK, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 13-11496
Hon. Lawrence P. Zatkoff

VERNAL SIMMS, et al.,

Defendants.
_____/

ORDER

Plaintiffs submitted their third *pro se* complaint [dkt 1] on April 2, 2013, and third application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [dkt 2] on April 26, 2013. The Court previously denied Plaintiffs' applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismissed their *pro se* complaints on May 17, 2013. *See Sedlak v. Simms*, No. 12-14100, 2013 WL 2155600 (E.D. Mich. May 17, 2013). Here, Plaintiffs raise the exact claims that they did in their previous *pro se* complaints, and for the same reasons, the Court dismisses Plaintiffs' instant *pro se* complaint.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [dkt 2] is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' *pro se* complaint [dkt 1] is DISMISSED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs are enjoined from filing subsequent actions without seeking and obtaining the Court's leave.

s/Lawrence P. Zatkoff
Hon. Lawrence P. Zatkoff
U.S. District Judge

Date: May 30, 2013