

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DARIEN HOUSER,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 10-0416
v.	)	Magistrate Judge Cynthia Reed Eddy
	)	
JEFFREY BEARD, et al,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	
	)	

**ORDER DENYING RELIEF REQUESTED IN  
PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE TO INFORM THE COURT (ECF NO. 176)**

On May 14, 2013, this Court entered an Order (ECF No. 172) directing defendants to respond to three filings by Plaintiff which this Court deemed to be (mostly) in the nature of discovery requests, namely, “Plaintiff’s Objections & Response to Magistrate Judge Order and Defendants Response to Plaintiff’s Objections,” “Response to Magistrate Judge Amend Case Management Order,” and “Notice” (respectively at ECF Nos. 169-171). This Order also stayed the Case Management Order scheduling motions for summary judgment and responses until Plaintiff’s deemed discovery motions were sorted out.

The Order also expressly stated:

3. Plaintiff shall not file any additional motions, notices, letters or similar items related to discovery or the matters he raises in “Plaintiff’s Objections & Response to Magistrate Judge Order and Defendants Response to Plaintiff’s Objections,” “Response to Magistrate Judge Amend Case Management Order,” and “Notice” (respectively at ECF Nos. 169, 170, 171) until resolution of his outstanding “motions” and further Order of Court.

Notwithstanding this plain and unambiguous court order to refrain from filing any additional motions, notices, etc., related to discovery or the other matters raised in Plaintiff’s

deemed discovery related motions, (ECF No. 169-171), on June 12, 2013, Plaintiff filed a “Notice to Inform the Court.” (ECF No. 176). Although there are some current events described in the “Notice to Inform the Court,” those events and the additional content of this additional notice relate to the discovery disputes and other matters pending for this Court’s consideration at (ECF No. 169-171). This Court will dismiss this Notice, and deny all of the requested Court actions set forth therein, as it contradicts the Order of May 14, 2013 (ECF No. 172).

Plaintiff’s deemed discovery related motions, (ECF No. 169-171) and the responses thereto are being considered by the Court and decision is expected shortly. Until such time, the Order prohibiting Plaintiff from filing any additional motions, notices, letters or similar items related to discovery or the matters he raises in “Plaintiff’s Objections & Response to Magistrate Judge Order and Defendants Response to Plaintiff’s Objections,” “Response to Magistrate Judge Amend Case Management Order,” and “Notice” (respectively at ECF Nos. 169, 170, 171) until resolution of his outstanding “motions” and further Order of Court remains in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 28, 2013

s Cynthia Reed Eddy

Cynthia Reed Eddy  
United States Magistrate Judge

cc: all counsel of record

Darien Houser  
GL-7509  
175 Progress Drive  
Waynesburg, PA 15370