

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

<p>JULIE LYNN CARPER,</p> <p style="text-align:right">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align:center">v.</p> <p>STATE OF NEBRASKA, MICHAEL G. HEAVICAN, Chief Justice, JANICE WALKER, State Court Administrator, and OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,</p> <p style="text-align:right">Defendants.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>4:12CV3182</p> <p>MEMORANDUM AND ORDER</p>
--	--	--

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff Julie Lynn Carper’s (“Plaintiff”) “Motion[s] to Proceed with Discovery” (Filing Nos. [15](#) and [22](#)), “Motion for Arbitration” (Filing No. [18](#)), “Motion for Warning or Sanction” (Filing No. [19](#)), “Motion for Exemption of PACER Fees” (Filing No. [23](#)), “Motion for Expedited Preliminary Hearing Injunctive Relief” (Filing No. [25](#)), and “Motion for Criminal Complaint” (Filing No. [29](#)). Also pending is Defendants’ Motion to Strike numerous filings by Plaintiff. (Filing No. [26](#).) Upon careful consideration,

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff’s “Motion[s] to Proceed with Discovery” (Filing Nos. [15](#) and [22](#)) are denied because, as the court informed Plaintiff previously, no discovery in pro se civil cases shall take place until the court enters a progression order. (*See* Filing No. [3](#).) The court has not entered a progression order in this case, and the court declines to enter one prior to the resolution of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss.

2. Plaintiff’s “Motion for Arbitration” (Filing No. [18](#)), “Motion for Warning or Sanction” (Filing No. [19](#)), “Motion for Expedited Preliminary Hearing

Injunctive Relief” (Filing No. [25](#)), and “Motion for Criminal Complaint” (Filing No. [29](#)) are denied because they are frivolous, nonsensical, or both. **Plaintiff is cautioned against filing frivolous motions.** Filing frivolous motions could result in further action by this court, including sanctions.

3. Plaintiff’s “Motion for Exemption of PACER fees” (Filing No. [23](#)) is denied without prejudice to reassertion after the court resolves Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, to which Plaintiff has already responded.

4. Defendants’ Motion to Strike (Filing No. [26](#)) is denied.

DATED this 22nd day of February, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon
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.