## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

| DAVID SCOTT KOVEN SR., and         | ) |           |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| ROXANNE DIANE KOVEN,               | ) |           |
|                                    | ) |           |
| Plaintiffs,                        | ) | 8:10CV373 |
|                                    | ) |           |
| <b>V.</b>                          | ) |           |
|                                    | ) |           |
| TODD HAMMOND, Plattsmouth          | ) | ORDER     |
| Police Officer, LEROY LEWIS,       | ) |           |
| Plattsmouth Police Officer, DAVID  | ) |           |
| MURDOCH, Plattsmouth Police        | ) |           |
| Chief, ROBERT SORENSON,            | ) |           |
| Plattsmouth Police Officer, ANDREW | ) |           |
| KENAN, Plattsmouth Police          | ) |           |
| Detective, and DAVID WALKER,       | ) |           |
| Plattsmouth Police Detective,      | ) |           |
|                                    | ) |           |
| Defendants.                        | ) |           |
|                                    |   |           |

On July 19, 2013, Plaintiffs, acting *pro se*, filed two motions in this case. Plaintiffs' first motion requests that the Court allow Plaintiffs to respond to their former counsel's Motion to Withdraw (filing 83). The Motion to Withdraw was filed under seal and granted by the Court on July 12, 2013 (filing 84). Through their second motion, Plaintiffs ask that the Court conduct a hearing to discuss various issues in this case, including, but not limited to, adding new claims and progression deadlines. Each of Plaintiffs' motions will be denied.

With respect to the first motion, Plaintiffs' former counsel has already been granted leave to withdraw. The Court will not reconsider this ruling and, thus, there is no need for Plaintiffs to respond to the Motion to Withdraw at this time. The Court will, however, direct the Clerk of Court to mail Plaintiffs a copy of the sealed Motion to Withdraw (filing 83). The Court believes, however, that a copy of the sealed motion was previously provided to Plaintiffs.

As to Plaintiffs' second motion, the Court sees no need for a conference at this time. As Plaintiffs were previously made aware, should they desire to proceed *pro se*, that is, without the assistance of counsel (which the Court strongly discourages), they bear the responsibility of complying with all Court orders, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules of Practice. The Court refers Plaintiffs to the Court's website, <u>www.ned.uscourts.gov.</u>, which has links to the Court's Local Rules and provides some guidance for litigants proceeding without an attorney.

## **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 1. Plaintiffs' Motion Under Seal (<u>filing 87</u>) is denied.
- 2. Plaintiffs' Motion for Conference (<u>filing 88</u>) is denied.
- 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order, as well as a copy of Plaintiffs' former counsel's sealed Motion to Withdraw (<u>filing 83</u>), to Plaintiffs at their address of record.

## DATED July 23, 2013.

## **BY THE COURT:**

S/ F.A. Gossett United States Magistrate Judge