

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ROBERT R. STEWART,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 DOROTHY SKORUPA, She acted)
 under the color of law in her official)
 capacity, Supervisor, PATRICIA)
 SUE HARTWELL, She acted in the)
 color of law in her official capacity,)
 Employment and Training)
 Coordinator, HOLLY LEWIS, She)
 acted under the color of law in her)
 official capacity, Assistant Manager,)
 Lincoln Parks and Recreation, and)
 LYNN JOHNSON, He acted under)
 the colof of law in his official)
 capacity, Parks and Recreation)
 Director,)
)
 Defendants.)

4:12CV3184

**MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER**

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s discovery requests (Filing Nos. [26](#) and [27](#)), and Defendant’s Objection to Plaintiff’s discovery requests (Filing No. [31](#)). As Plaintiff has already been informed, shortly after he filed this action, the clerk’s office delivered to him a copy of the court’s General Order Number 2007-12, which states that “[n]o discovery in pro se civil cases assigned to a district judge shall take place until . . . a progression order is entered unless permitted by the court.” (Filing No. [4](#) at CM/ECF p. 1.) Here, the court has not entered a progression order, and will not enter one until after it has ruled on Defendant Patricia Sue Hartwell’s Motion to Dismiss. (See Filing No. [18](#).) The court will rule on the Motion to Dismiss in its normal course of business. Accordingly, the court will sustain Defendant’s Objection

to Plaintiff's discovery requests (Filing No. [31](#)). Plaintiff may not engage in discovery until the court enters a progression order.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that: Defendant's Objection to Plaintiff's discovery requests (Filing No. [31](#)) is sustained.

DATED this 20th day of June, 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.