

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

9

\* \* \*

10

ROBERT CSECH,

Case No. 3:13-cv-00263-MMD-WGC

11

Plaintiff,

ORDER

12

v.

13

STEPHEN D. QUINN, et al.,

14

Defendants.

15

16

This closed *pro se* prisoner civil rights case by a Nevada state inmate comes before the Court on multiple motions filed by plaintiff after entry of final judgment, including an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (dkt. no. 9), motion for Rule 65 relief (dkt. no. 10), and motion for an order to show cause (dkt. no. 11).

20

The Court dismissed this improperly-commenced action “without prejudice to the filing of a new complaint on the required form in a new action together with a new pauper application.” The Court discussed why such a dismissal without prejudice to the filing of a new and properly commenced action would not result in substantial prejudice to petitioner. See dkt. no. 2, at 2 & n.1.

25

Plaintiff may not simply disregard the order and judgment of dismissal and continue to file motions for relief as if the action had not been dismissed. He instead must present all such motions and requests for relief in a new action under a new docket number.

28


1           It therefore is ordered that all motions and requests for relief herein are denied  
2 without prejudice to the pursuit of such relief in a new action under a new docket  
3 number.

4           The Clerk of Court shall send plaintiff another copy of all papers submitted herein  
5 to date.

6           This action has been, and remains, closed by a final judgment.

7           DATED THIS 6<sup>th</sup> day of March 2014.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MIRANDA M. DU  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE