

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

NADINE PELLEGRINO AND	:	
HARRY WALDMAN,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	NO. 09-5505
	:	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
TRANSPORTATION SECURITY	:	
ADMINISTRATION, et. al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 11th day of August, 2014, upon consideration of Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 178) and Plaintiff's Consolidated Motion for Reconsideration and Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 182), Plaintiff's Exhibits (Doc. No. 183, 184, 185, 186) and Defendants' Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 192), as well as Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File (Doc. No. 191), it is hereby ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration is GRANTED in part, and Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED in part.

This Court's Order of April 16, 2014 is amended in order to grant summary judgment on Plaintiff's claims of retaliatory and malicious prosecution under the First and Fourth Amendments as to Defendants Abdul-Malik and Labbee. It is further ORDERED that judgment shall be ENTERED in favor of those Defendants and Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 40) is dismissed

with prejudice as to those claims.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff shall submit, within thirty (30) days of entry of this Order, a concise¹ Memorandum of Law no more than twenty five (25) pages in length, written in twelve(12)-point font for text and ten (10)- point font for footnotes, outlining Plaintiff's position regarding Defendant TSA's withholding of 90 documents under 5 U.S.C. § 552(b) (2), (b) (5), and (b) (6). Defendant TSA shall submit a reply, if any, within fourteen (14) days of Plaintiff's filing.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File is DENIED.

BY THE COURT:

s/J. Curtis Joyner
J. CURTIS JOYNER, J.

¹ Plaintiff has been admonished numerous time by the Court for her needlessly voluminous submissions and disregard for Court-imposed deadlines. See, e.g., (Doc. Nos. 33, 93). In fact, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration was filed in two parts totaling over 250 pages exclusive of exhibits. (Doc. Nos. 182, 188). As a result, the Court has no choice but to impose page limits on Plaintiff's future filings. The Court also warns Plaintiff that it may dismiss a FOIA claim based on a plaintiff's failure to timely submit a filing. Idema v. United States Department of State, No. 05-1334, 2007 WL 2258543 (D.D.C. Aug. 6, 2007) (dismissing FOIA claim based on plaintiffs' failure to file a response by extended deadline).