

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

SUR G. NOVEL,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Civil Action 2:14-cv-264
Judge Watson
Magistrate Judge King

JEFFERY A. ZAPOR, et al.,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff, who is proceeding without the assistance of counsel, brings this action against twenty-two (22) defendants, including government employees, attorneys, and law firms, in connection with various state court civil and disciplinary proceedings. See *Amended Complaint*, ECF 4. All defendants have filed motions to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction or for failure to state a claim for relief, or both. See ECF 19, 22, 27, 33, 34, 38, 40, 42, 44, 48, 49, 58, 59, 67. This matter is now before the Court on plaintiff's motion, ECF 33, seeking leave to file documents using the Court's Electronic Case Filing ("ECF") system.

Plaintiff argues that he should be permitted to file documents in the ECF system because it is unduly burdensome for him to manually file documents. Plaintiff resides in Thailand. *Complaint*, ¶ 1. According to plaintiff, he must cut paper to meet the Court's standards because 8 ½" x 11" paper is not sold in Thailand; he must travel to a post office and wait in line to mail his filings; it is

expensive to send mail to the United States from Thailand; and this action will be delayed because of the time required for mailing documents from Thailand. Plaintiff also argues that denying him access to the ECF system violates anti-trust laws, his Fourteenth Amendment right to equal protection, and the Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations between Thailand and the United States of America. Plaintiff's arguments are not well taken.

There is a presumption in this Court that *pro se* litigants will file documents manually. The Court's local rules require all pleadings, motions, briefs, and other papers presented to the Clerk for filing to be on 8 ½" x 11" paper and that filings by *pro se* litigants be filed on paper. S.D. Ohio Civ. R. 5.1(a), (c). The Court's Electronic Filing Policies and Procedures Manual ("ECF Manual") also provides that "[p]arties proceeding *pro se* shall not file electronically, unless otherwise ordered by the court." ECF Manual § 1(A). These requirements apply to all *pro se* litigants, regardless of whether the litigants are Ohio residents or not. Plaintiff's general argument that he must expend more time and money to prepare and mail his filings is not sufficient overcome the general presumption that all *pro se* litigants are required to file documents manually. Moreover, the Court notes that defendant Thomas G. Rassing, who is a former attorney appearing *pro se* in this matter, has been filing documents manually and has objected to plaintiff's use of the ECF system on the basis that "he is retired, senior, and does not have computer skills or the ability to handle electronic filing." ECF 34.

The Court also notes that the history of this case demonstrates that requiring plaintiff to manually file documents has not affected his ability to prosecute this action.

Accordingly, plaintiff's motion, ECF 33, is **DENIED**.

December 15, 2014

s/Norah McCann King
Norah M^cCann King
United States Magistrate Judge