

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ALEXANDER W. OPPENHEIM, et)	
al.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	8:11CV437
)	
v.)	
)	
KEITH M. LAMPERT,)	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Motion to Correct Errors (Filing No. [22](#)), Motion to Correct Case Code (Filing No. [23](#)) and Motion to Seal Amended Complaint (Filing No. [24](#)). The Court will address each motion in turn.

In his Motion to Correct Errors and Motion to Correct Case Code, plaintiff states that sometime in March 2012, this action was reclassified as a "Prisoner's Rights/Prisoner's Petition." (Filing Nos. [22](#) and [23](#).) Plaintiff asks the Court to reclassify this case as "Civil Rights-Other Civil Rights." (Filing No. [23](#).) However, the Court classifies, and may reclassify, cases for internal statistical purposes. Accordingly, plaintiff's Motion to Correct Case Code and Motion to Correct Errors will be denied.

In his Motion to Seal Amended Complaint, plaintiff asks the Court to seal his Amended Complaint because it contains "confidential" facts (Filing No. [24](#)). The Court will grant plaintiff's Motion to Seal.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Correct Errors (Filing No. [22](#)) and Motion to Correct Case Code (Filing No. [23](#)) are denied.

2. Plaintiff's Motion to Seal Amended Complaint (Filing No. [24](#)) is granted. The Clerk of the court is directed to seal plaintiff's Amended Complaint (i.e. Filing No. [16](#)).

DATED this 24th day of April, 2012.

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.