

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
3:11-cv-220-RJC**

JORGE GALEAS, JR.,)
(also known as “Jorge Gevara”))
))
Plaintiff,)
))
))
v.)
))
WILLIAM HORNE et al.,)
))
))
Defendants.)

ORDER

THIS MATTER comes before the Court upon a Motion by Plaintiff for Reconsideration, (Doc. No. 20), and a Motion by Defendants for Extension of Time to Answer or Otherwise Plead, (Doc. No. 28).

I. DISCUSSION

This is one of seven civil rights actions that Plaintiff currently has pending before this Court. In some of the actions, Plaintiff has identified himself as Jorge Galeas, Jr. Plaintiff is identified as “Jorge Gevara” by the North Carolina Department of Correction. Plaintiff has been inundating the Court with motions in all of his actions, and the Court is quickly becoming convinced that some of the motions are being filed merely to harass the Court. Most of the motions have proven to be frivolous.

With regard to Plaintiff’s pending motion for reconsideration, (Doc. No. 20), the Court will deny this motion for the same reasons that the Court previously denied Plaintiff’s four prior motions for reconsideration. See (Doc. No. 18). Furthermore, a review of the matters filed in this Court reflects that many of Plaintiff’s pleadings and letters are duplicative, thereby

evidencing his intent to, at the very least, abuse the Court and usurp scarce judicial resources. Notwithstanding his lack of success, Plaintiff shows no indication that he will cease his abusive conduct. Accordingly, Plaintiff is cautioned that any further attempt to abuse this Court by filing successive, frivolous complaints or motions could result in the issuance of a pre-filing review order and/or an order to show cause why an injunction should not be entered against him. See Graham v. Riddle, 554 F.2d 133 (4th Cir. 1977); In re Rochester, 292 F. App'x 226 (4th Cir. Aug. 29, 2008) (unpublished).

Finally, for good cause shown, Defendants' Motion for Extension of Time to Answer or Otherwise Plead, (Doc. No. 28), is granted.

II. CONCLUSION

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, (Doc. No. 20), is **DENIED**;
2. Defendants' Motion for Extension of Time to Answer or Otherwise Plead, (Doc. No. 28), is **GRANTED**, and Defendants have 60 days from entry of this Order in which to Answer or otherwise plead; and
3. Plaintiff is **hereby warned** that if he continues to drain the Court's scarce resources with frivolous and/or harassing motions in any of his pending cases, the Court will consider entering an order directing that all documents submitted by Plaintiff in the future be pre-screened for content and that any such document that is not made in good faith or which does not contain substance or merit will be returned to Plaintiff without explanation.

Signed: February 8, 2012



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge

