IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| HAROLD CRISP,<br><br>Plaintiff,<br><br>v.<br><br>HAROLD CLARK, FRANK HOPKINS, MADSON, ROBERT HOUSTON, DOCTOR, RINE SABATKA, and NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES,<br><br>Defendants. | ) | 4:10CV3125<br><br>**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER** |

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On June 29, 2010, Plaintiff filed an unsigned Complaint. (Filing No. 1.) On June 30, 2010, the Clerk of the court informed Plaintiff of his signature deficiency. (Filing No. 2.) In doing so, the court warned Plaintiff that if he failed to correct the deficiency within 15 days, his Complaint could be stricken from the record. (*Id*.) Plaintiff failed to correct this deficiency. (*See* Docket Sheet.)

On July 21, 2010, the court issued a Memorandum and Order that directed Plaintiff to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with court orders. (Filing No. 5.) In doing so, the court cautioned Plaintiff that if he failed to respond, or show good cause, by August 2, 2010, this matter would be dismissed without further notice. (*Id*.) Plaintiff has not responded to the court's July 21, 2010, Memorandum and Order. (*See* Docket Sheet.)

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. This matter is dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to prosecute this matter diligently and failed to comply with this court's orders.

2. A separate judgment will be entered in accordance with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 10th day of August, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

*Richard G. Kopf*
United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.