



1 because he had regained his box of legal papers.<sup>5</sup> Johnson's motion pertains to 10 cases,  
2 including this one, that he filed in this District and purports to include a report from Las Vegas  
3 Metropolitan Police Department documenting Johnson's claim that his box of legal papers was  
4 missing.<sup>6</sup> No such report was actually included with the motion.

5        Although I am sympathetic to Johnson’s claim that he was without his legal papers for  
6 some time, that does not explain why he failed to timely comply with Magistrate Judge Koppe’s  
7 order to or seek to extend the time to do so. It appears from the one-size-fits-all approach that  
8 Johnson used for his motion that he has not kept himself informed of the status of his many cases  
9 in this District. Johnson has not demonstrated that the without-prejudice dismissal of his claims  
10 was the product of his excusable neglect or that good cause exists to set my dismissal order aside  
11 and reopen this case.

12 I THEREFORE ORDER that Johnson's motion to reopen this case (**ECF No. 15**) is  
13 **DENIED**. If Johnson wants to pursue the claims that were at issue in this case, he must file a  
14 complaint in a **new action** and pay the required fee or file an application to proceed in forma  
15 pauperis for non-prisoners.

16 I further order that Johnson's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 14) is  
17 DENIED as moot. **No other documents should be filed in this closed case.**

18 | Dated: January 11, 2022

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. District Judge

23||<sup>5</sup> ECF No. 15.

6 *Id.*