

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

CONNIE STEELMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:12CV00182 ERW
)	
A&M INVESTMENTS, LLC,)	
d/b/a Rolla Family Clinic,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff’s motion for relief. In her pro se motion, plaintiff seeks to have the Court remind defense counsel “to comply with COURTS LAWS OF ASSERTIVENESS, and NOT HARASSMENT.” In her conclusory motion for relief, plaintiff appears to be asserting that she thinks that defense counsel is attempting to use their knowledge of the Federal Rules and case law to their advantage in this action.

The Court recognizes that plaintiff is an individual and finds she may proceed in this case pro se, that is, without the assistance of counsel. That said, as a pro se party plaintiff must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of this Court. Akra Direct Mktg. Corp. v. Fingerhut Corp., 86 F.3d 852, 856 (8th Cir.1996) (pro se representation does not excuse a party from complying with a court's orders and with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure); see also, U.S. v. Wilkes, 20 F.3d


651, 653 (5th Cir. 1994); Boswell v. Honorable Governor of Texas, 138 F.Supp.2d 782, 785 (N.D. Texas 2000).

In the past plaintiff has chosen to communicate with the Court through letters and unstructured and conclusory correspondence. The Court will no longer accept letters from the plaintiff, and any letters will be returned without consideration or filing. In the future, plaintiff shall communicate with the Court through written motions and filings, with proper citations to the Federal Rules and case law, all of which must be properly served on opposing counsel. Plaintiff's motions and memoranda before this Court shall not be brought for an improper purpose or to harass or delay these proceedings, and she is reminded that there can be severe ramifications for a party's failure to comply with both the Federal Rules and Orders from this Court.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for relief [ECF No. 17] is **DENIED**.

So Ordered this 24th day of August, 2012.



E. RICHARD WEBBER
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE