

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENWOOD DIVISION

Tyrone Lamar Roberson, #191327,)	C/A NO. 8:09-1333-CMC-BHH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-versus-)	OPINION and ORDER
)	
South Carolina Department of Corrections,)	
Jon E. Ozmint, SCDC Office of General)	
Counsel,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s *pro se* “Motion for Transcript at Government Expense.” Dkt. # 60 (filed May 7, 2010). Plaintiff seeks the “transcript” of various items which he has filed, as they are “necessary for consideration of an issue presented” in Plaintiff’s appeal. Mot. at 1.

Initially, the court notes that there were no in-court proceedings held in this matter. Therefore, any materials Plaintiff seeks produced at Government expense were filed in this case by Plaintiff, and these material are available to the Court of Appeals for that court’s review via the electronic docketing system that exists between the courts. To the extent that Plaintiff seeks copies of these documents be provided to him, Plaintiff’s *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) filing status does not extend to the free production of copies of materials which are part of the record of this case.

Therefore, to the extent Plaintiff seeks to ensure that these filings will be reviewed by the Court of Appeals, Plaintiff’s motion is moot. To the extent Plaintiff seeks free copies of materials for his records and/or inclusion in an informal brief to the Court of Appeals, Plaintiff’s motion is **denied**, as he presents no particularized need (beyond his IFP status) for obtaining copies at Government expense. *See Jones v. Superintendent, Virginia State Farm*, 460 F.2d 150, 152-53 (4th Cir. 1972); *United States v. Glass*, 317 F.2d 200, 202 (4th Cir. 1963).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
May 11, 2010

C:\Documents and Settings\nac60\Desktop\09-1333 Order.wpd