

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

MOUSEN ADEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

DR. RYAN HERRINGTON, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:12-cv-86

Spiegel, J.  
Bowman, M.J.

**ORDER**

This prisoner civil rights litigation was initiated by Plaintiff on January 30, 2012. On March 8, 2012, the undersigned magistrate judge granted Plaintiff leave to proceed in forma pauperis on certain claims, and directed the United States Marshal to serve two of the named Defendants on those claims. However, the undersigned also issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") that recommended the dismissal of specific claims brought against three other Defendants. (Doc. 7). On May 15, 2012, the presiding district judge adopted that R&R and ordered Plaintiff's equal protection claim to proceed, while dismissing claims concerning the adequacy of Plaintiff's medical care for an ankle injury. (Doc. 16). However, on September 12, 2012, the Court vacated its prior order adopting the R&R, granted Plaintiff's motion for relief from that order, and permitted Plaintiff additional time in which to file any objections to the R&R. (Doc. 33). Plaintiff filed objections on September 24, 2012, which remain pending before the

presiding district judge.

In addition to objections to the pending R&R, Plaintiff filed a motion “for case status and copies.” (Doc. 36). That non-dispositive motion has been referred to the undersigned magistrate judge and is addressed below.

Plaintiff seeks “a summary of the status of the case; chronologically ordered outline of all the documents filed on the docket, and a copy of the ‘filed’ stamped copies of the original complaint and all the documents provided in the commencing of this action. For the most part, Plaintiff’s motion will be denied, because indigent civil litigants are not entitled to free copies but instead must bear their own litigation expenses. *Dujardine v. Michigan Dept. Of Corrections*, 2009 WL 3401172 at \*1 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 19, 2009)(collecting cases). To the extent that Plaintiff himself originally filed the complaint and other documents, he should have retained a copy and is presumed to know the contents. To the extent that documents have been filed by Defendants or by this Court, Plaintiff has already been served with a copy by the Clerk of Court. Additional copies of any document are available by writing to the Clerk of Court, and enclosing prepayment in the amount of 10 cents per page for any document that is filed in the electronic case record.

Nevertheless, because the record also reflects that Plaintiff’s address of record has changed more than once since the commencement of this litigation,<sup>1</sup> and that the Clerk of Court re-served mail initially returned as “undeliverable,” the Court will direct

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff filed a change of address only once, but a second change of address was entered by the Clerk in response to other motions filed by Plaintiff. Plaintiff is reminded that it is the obligation of every litigant to update the Court with his current address, failing which, litigation may become subject to dismissal for failure to prosecute.

the Clerk to serve Plaintiff with a copy of the docket sheet. Should Plaintiff believe that he is still missing copies of any prior Order of this Court, as reflected on that docket sheet, Plaintiff may renew his motion by identifying the particular document that he failed to receive, and setting forth why he believes he did not receive.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED THAT** Plaintiff's motion for case status and for copies (Doc. 26) be **granted in part** and **denied in part**. The Clerk of Court shall forward to Plaintiff a single copy of the docket sheet, but need not forward Plaintiff copies of any document identified therein absent prepayment, or further Order of this Court.

*s/ Stephanie K. Bowman*  
Stephanie K. Bowman  
United States Magistrate Judge