

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
 WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
 ST. JOSEPH DIVISION

ROBERT RAY YOUNG,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 09-6061-CV-SJ-HFS
	)	
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	)	
AND SENIOR SERVICES, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Several motions are pending. First, plaintiff filed a cryptic motion which seeks a “new court order for my safty [sic], health.” In the motion, plaintiff complains about the actions of defendant Stacey Thomas, an employee of Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services. The relief sought is unclear, so the motion must be denied. Next, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the court’s order denying appointment of counsel and a new motion for appointment of counsel. For reasons stated in the two prior orders on this issue (ECF docs. 4 and 12), these motions will be denied.

In addition, defendants Samuel Fadare and Zafar Mahmood filed a motion for leave to file their answer out of time. Their proposed answer is filed as Exhibit 2. The motion is unopposed and will be granted. Next, plaintiff filed a motion that seems to contest a guardianship action that Thomas and MDHSS filed in Clay County Circuit Court.<sup>1</sup> He claims it was an “act of retaliation.” Again, the court cannot discern what relief plaintiff seeks, other than to apprise the court of what

---

<sup>1</sup>Subsequent filings show that the guardianship action was later dismissed without prejudice.

happened. Moreover, the court has no jurisdiction over cases pending in other courts. Therefore, the motion will be denied.

Also pending is plaintiff's motion for extension of time to respond to a motion to dismiss. Two motions to dismiss are pending, one by defendants Fadare and Mahmood (ECF doc. 46) and one by Thomas and MDHSS (ECF doc. 49). Giving plaintiff the benefit of the doubt, the court will infer that he seeks an extension as to both motions. His motion is unopposed and will be granted. Plaintiff must file his responses to the motions to dismiss within 14 days. Lastly, plaintiff filed a motion that the court construes as asking that his pending motions be ruled prior to the motions to dismiss. That has now occurred. Thus, the motion will be granted.

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for order (ECF doc. 33) is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF doc. 36) is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (ECF doc. 40) is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that defendants Samuel Fadare and Zafar Mahmood's joint motion for leave to file their answer out of time (ECF doc. 39) is GRANTED. Those defendants' answer, filed as Exhibit 2 to the motion, is deemed filed. It is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for order (ECF doc. 42) is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for extension of time (ECF doc. 50) is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall file responses to the two motions to dismiss (ECF docs. 46 and 49) within 14 days of the date of this order. It is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for order (ECF doc. 52) is GRANTED. It is further  
ORDERED that the clerk of the court shall send a copy of this order by regular and certified  
mail, return receipt requested, to plaintiff Robert Ray Young, 3523 S. Lynn, Apt. A, Independence,  
Missouri 64055.

/s/ Howard F. Sachs  
HOWARD F. SACHS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

January 6, 2011

Kansas City, Missouri