

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

BEAUFORD WILMER WINTERS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	4:13CV3135
)	
v.)	
)	
BAKER, Sgt. (of the Tecumseh)	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
State Correctional)	
Institution), BALLUE, Cpl,)	
SANFORD, Cpl., and HERREA, &)	
Cpl. (of the Tecumseh Stat)	
Correctional Institution),)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion for Copies (Filing No. [15](#)). 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.

In his motion, plaintiff also indicates that he would like defendants to produce certain items in discovery (Filing No. [15](#)). However, defendants have not yet been served with plaintiff's complaint and this Court has not permitted discovery in this matter. (See Docket Sheet.) Accordingly, plaintiff's motion, to the extent he seeks to compel discovery, will be denied.

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's Motion for Copies (Filing No. [15](#)) is denied.

DATED this 6th day of December, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Lyle E. Strom

LYLE E. STROM, Senior Judge
United States District Court

* 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.