

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

AUDREY MELENA, on Behalf of)
Minor Children,)

8:10CV337

Petitioner,)

v.)

**MEMORANDUM
AND ORDER**

WADIE THOMAS, Honorable, Judge)
of the Separate Juvenile Nebraska)
Court, JOHN JAMES, EDNA)
JAMES, BATALION, Judge,)
Nebraska Douglas County District)
Judge, DAVID TERRELL, and)
NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF)
HEALTH AND HUMAN)
SERVICES,)

Respondents.)

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On September 14, 2010, the Clerk of the court sent a Notice acknowledging the receipt of Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to Petitioner at her last known address. (Filing No. 3.) On September 17, 2010, that document was returned to the court as “Undeliverable.” (Filing No. 4.) No forwarding information was provided. (*Id.*)

Petitioner has an obligation to keep the court informed of her current address at all times. See NEGenR 1.3(e) and (g) (requiring pro se parties to adhere to local rules and inform the court of address changes within 30 days). This case cannot be prosecuted in this court if Petitioner’s whereabouts remain unknown.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner shall have until **October 20, 2010**, to apprise the court of her current address, in the absence of which this case will be dismissed without prejudice and without further notice.

2. The Clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this case using the following text: **October 20, 2010**: deadline to inform court of new address.

DATED this 20th day of September, 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.