

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

ANTONIO FONTAINE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No.: 3:20-CV-220-TAV-HBG
	)	
TONY PARKER,	)	
DOUGLAS STEPHENS,	)	
MIKE PARRIS, and	)	
JANE JONES,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

The Court is in receipt of a pro se prisoner’s complaint for violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 [Doc. 2] and related motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Doc. 1].

This Court has conducted an initial review of the complaint and determined that it is identical to a pending action Plaintiff previously filed in this Court, *Antonio Fontaine v. Tony Parker, et al.*, 3:20-cv-217. Inasmuch as Plaintiff has no right or reason to proceed in two identical actions, this action will be **DISMISSED** as duplicative, and Plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Doc. 1] is **DISMISSED** as moot.<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *Scott v. Burress*, No. 2:09–cv–10916, 2009 WL 891695, \* 1 (E.D. Mich. March 31, 2009) (dismissing later-filed prisoner civil rights complaint because it was duplicative of earlier-filed complaint).

**ENTER:**

s/ Thomas A. Varlan  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court declines to grant Plaintiff *in forma pauperis status* and thereby obligate him to pay the filing fee for initiating duplicative litigation, as it is uncertain whether Plaintiff intended for the Court to treat this repetitive complaint as an additional, separate action.