

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

SHANNON WILLIAMS,)	4:12CV3217
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
SUSAN DEVETTER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Status and Copies. (Filing No. [30](#).) In his Motion, Plaintiff asks the court to update him on the status of his Rule 59(e) Motion. (*Id.*) The court denied Plaintiff’s Rule 59(e) Motion on May 7, 2013, and previously updated him on that denial in a Memorandum and Order issued on July 9, 2013. (See Filing Nos. [18](#) and [28](#).) To the extent this Memorandum further clarifies that the court denied his Rule 59(e) Motion, Plaintiff’s Motion for Status is granted.

Plaintiff also asks the court for a copy of the docket sheet in this matter. (Filing No. [30](#).) Plaintiff does not have the right to receive copies of documents without payment, even if the court granted him leave to proceed in forma pauperis. [28 U.S.C. § 1915](#); see also [Haymes v. Smith, 73 F.R.D. 572, 574 \(W.D.N.Y. 1976\)](#) (“The generally recognized rule is that a court may not authorize the commitment of federal funds to underwrite the necessary expenditures of an indigent civil litigant’s action.”) (citing [Tyler v. Lark, 472 F.2d 1077 \(8th Cir. 1973\)](#), other citations omitted). If Plaintiff requires copies of court documents, he should contact the Clerk of the court to determine the proper method of requesting and paying for copies. Plaintiff’s request for copies is therefore denied.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that: Plaintiff’s Motion for Status and Copies (filing no. [30](#)) is granted in part and denied in part in accordance with this Memorandum and Order.

DATED this 6th day of September, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf

Senior 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.