

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
WESTERN DIVISION**

LARONDA PHOX,

Plaintiff,

v.

VIRTUOSO SOURCING GROUP, LLC,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 4:17-CV-00098-DGK

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO COMPLY

On June 29, 2017, the Court ordered Plaintiff to “show cause why she should not be enjoined from filing future lawsuits in this District by filing a written response to this order” and “include in her response a listing of every case she has filed in any court in the past twenty years, including pending matters, the nature of the action, the disposition of the action, and whether she paid any filing fees in each of those cases” (Doc. 16).

In response, Plaintiff asks the Court not to issue a pre-filing injunction. Plaintiff stated she was unable to comply with the Court’s order because she was not given sufficient time. In addition, Plaintiff believes the Court’s previous order was “done with the intention[] to harass, annoy, or disturb” her. Pl.’s Resp. at 3 (Doc. 17).

The Court “is vested with discretion to impose sanctions upon a party under its inherent disciplinary power.” *Bass v. General Motors Corp.*, 150 F.3d 842, 851 (8th Cir. 1998). “[J]udicial resources are limited in the short run and need to be protected from wasteful consumption. Frivolous, bad faith claims consume a significant amount of judicial resources, diverting the time and energy of the judiciary away from processing good faith claims.” *In re Tyler*, 839 F.2d 1290, 1292 (8th Cir. 1988). And “[d]efendants have a right to be free from

harassing, abusive, and meritless litigation.” *Id.* at 1293. “The Court may, in its discretion, place reasonable restrictions on any litigant who files non-meritorious actions for obviously malicious purposes and who generally abuses judicial process. These restrictions may be directed to provide limitations or conditions on the filing of future suits.” *Id.*

The Court is concerned with the number of lawsuits Plaintiff has filed in this district. Based on the Court’s research, she has filed thirteen cases in the Western District of Missouri since 2001, seven in the last five years alone. All of these cases resulted in dismissal or summary judgment for the defendant. The Court requested information related to Plaintiff’s past lawsuits in order to determine whether the Court should impose a restriction on Plaintiff’s ability to file additional lawsuits.

The Court grants Plaintiff additional time to comply with the Court’s June 29th Order. If Plaintiff fails to comply, the Court will consider requiring Plaintiff to pay a filing fee in this lawsuit and all future lawsuits filed in this Court.

Therefore, it is ORDERED that Plaintiff comply with the Court’s June 29th Order on or before August 25, 2017.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: August 8, 2017

/s/ Greg Kays
GREG KAYS, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT