IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

CHARLES SWIFT, Plaintiff, v. MICHELLE ADAMS, and EUSTACHIA MOSS, Defendants.	)	8:15CV327 **MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Plaintiff, a non-prisoner, filed a Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis. (Filing No. 2.) Upon review of Plaintiff's Motion, the court finds that Plaintiff is financially eligible to proceed in forma pauperis.

A word of caution to Swift: Swift has filed six civil actions in this court since August of 2014; four of them in 2015. The court cautions Swift of the rule that his right of access to the courts is not absolute and that he will not be allowed to abuse the legal system. *See In re Winslow*, 17 F.3d 314, 315 (10th Cir. 1994). Indeed, this court has the authority to enjoin a litigant who abuses the court system through vexatious and harassing litigation. *See, e.g.*, *Tripati v. Beaman*, 878 F.2d 351, 352 (10th Cir. 1989). If the court determines at some later time that Swift has abused the legal system, the court may impose sanctions and filing restrictions.

IT IS ORDERED that leave to proceed in forma pauperis is provisionally granted, and the Complaint shall be filed without payment of fees. However, the court cautions Swift that abusing the privilege to proceed in forma pauperis could result in appropriate sanctions. Swift is advised that the next step in his case will be for the court to conduct an initial review of his claims to determine whether summary dismissal is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The court will conduct this initial review in its normal course of business.

DATED this 4th day of September, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

s/ John M. Gerrard
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.