

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

TIMOTHY HICKMAN-SMITH,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	4:14CV3205
)	
v.)	
)	
SCHMADER, Chief Omaha Police,)	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
and TWO JOHN DOE UNKNOWN)	
OMAHA POLICE OFFICERS,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court on its own motion. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 states that "every pleading . . . must be signed by at least one attorney of record . . . or by a party personally if the party is unrepresented." [Fed. R. Civ. P. 11\(a\)](#). Further, "[t]he court must strike an unsigned paper unless the omission is promptly corrected after being called to the attorney's or party's attention." *Id.* Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, failed to sign his complaint.

On October 8, 2014, the Deputy Clerk notified plaintiff about the signature deficiency (Filing No. 4). Plaintiff was warned that if he failed to correct the deficiency within 15 days, his pleading could be stricken from the record of this case. More than a month has now passed, yet plaintiff has failed to sign his pleading. (See Docket Sheet.)

IT IS ORDERED:

1) Plaintiff shall have until December 19, 2014, to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for failure to comply with Rule 11. If plaintiff does not respond, or if good cause is not shown, this action 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 with the following text: December 19, 2014: deadline for plaintiff to show cause why pleading was not signed.

DATED this 3rd day of December, 2014.

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.