On July 26, 2011, petitioner submitted a letter and a request for judicial notice to this Court. (ECF Nos. 25 & 26). Both documents were submitted by petitioner *pro se*, rather than through his counsel of record. (*Id.*).

On July 27, 2011, respondents filed a motion to strike petitioner's filings on the basis that, because petitioner is represented by counsel, he may not file documents in *pro se*. (ECF No. 27). Respondents are correct. Pursuant to Local Rule 1A, 10-6, a party who is represented by counsel cannot appear or act in the case, but must proceed through counsel. As such, striking petitioner's *pro se* documents is appropriate.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that respondents' motion to strike (ECF No. 27) petitioner's *pro se* documents is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner's *pro se* letter and request for judicial notice at ECF Nos. 25 & 26 are **HEREBY STRICKEN**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner SHALL proceed through his counsel of record and shall file no further *pro se* documents. The Clerk of Court SHALL RETURN, UNFILED, any further *pro se* documents submitted by petitioner.

Dated this 1<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2011.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE