

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 ROBERT C. DENHAM JR.,

Case No. 2:18-cv-00163-JCM-VCF

4 Plaintiff

ORDER

5 v.

6 JAMES DZURENDA et al.,

7 Defendants
8

9
10 Presently before the court is plaintiff Robert Denham's ("plaintiff") "motion to
11 process application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis." (ECF No. 11). No response
12 has been filed, and the time to do so has passed. Also before the court is plaintiff's
13 "motion for clarification." (ECF No. 14).

14 On January 9, 2019, the court entered an order dismissing this action, without
15 prejudice, for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 7). Accordingly, the clerk
16 entered judgment and closed the case. (ECF No. 9). Now, plaintiff requests that the
17 court process his application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and "clarify" the
18 court's January 9, 2019, order dismissing the action. See (ECF Nos. 11, 14).

19 However, the court's previous order is clear that this action has been dismissed
20 for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. (ECF No. 7). Accordingly, this case has been
21 closed, and no further filings shall be entertained by the court pursuant to this action. If
22 plaintiff wishes to proceed on the claims asserted in this matter, he must file a new action
23 that is void of the deficiencies noted by the court in its previous order. Plaintiff's motions
24 are denied.

25 Accordingly,


26 IT IS ORDERED THAT plaintiff's motion to process application for leave to proceed
27 in forma pauperis (ECF No. 11) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for clarification (ECF No. 14) be,
and the same hereby is, DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED May 7, 2019.



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE