

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

RAYMOND H. STRICKLAND,)	CASE NO. 8:12CV288
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
MICHAEL T. FRUDIKER, and ROBERT)	
DELLUTRI, Correction Center Officers,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on its own motion. On May 30, 2013, the Clerk of the court sent a copy of the court's May 30, 2013, Progression Order to Plaintiff's last known address. (Filing No. [29](#); see also Docket Sheet.) On June 5, 2013, the Clerk of the court sent a copy of the court's June 5, 2013, Memorandum and Order denying Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint counsel to his last known address. (Filing No. [30](#); see also Docket Sheet.) Both copies were returned to the court as not deliverable, and no forwarding information was provided. (Filing Nos. [31](#) and [32](#).)

Plaintiff has an obligation to keep the court informed of his 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 Plaintiff's whereabouts remain unknown.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff shall have until **July 19, 2013**, to apprise the court of his 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: **July 19, 2013**: deadline to inform court of new address.

DATED this 21st day of June, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

s/Laurie Smith Camp
Chief 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.