

---

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION

---

Diane R. Prigge,

Plaintiff,

v.

Woods Cross Police Department, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER  
DENYING MOTION FOR CONSULTATION

Case No. 2:16-cv-00140-JNP-BCW

District Judge Jill Parrish

Magistrate Judge Brooke Wells

---

This case is referred to the undersigned from Judge Parrish in accordance with [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff, Ms. Prigge, filed a Complaint against the Woods Cross Police Department and other Defendants on March 28, 2016.<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff alleges she was handing out copies of her resume to local businesses around the area when she was “abducted form the Hampton Inn.”<sup>3</sup> According to Ms. Prigge, certain Woods Cross police officers showed up at her door and arrested her without a warrant.<sup>4</sup> Ms. Prigge then had to leave behind certain belongings when she left with the police. Ms. Prigge “was not booked, nor finger printed but given food inside a jail cell for two days.”<sup>5</sup> Plaintiff alleges she never received her cell phone back after it went missing.<sup>6</sup> Plaintiff also makes allegations against a court in New Jersey and Judge Andrea Carter who failed to correctly record Ms. Prigge’s daughter’s date of birth.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Docket no. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Docket no. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Complaint p. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* p. 2-4.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* p. 4.


<sup>6</sup> *Id.* p. 5.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* p. 6.

Plaintiff has filed a document that states she “requests in this motion for consultation as this matter is more complex than meet the eye.”<sup>8</sup> The court construes this document as a Motion for Consultation.<sup>9</sup> In her motion Ms. Prigge goes on to relate her experience in graduating with a degree in paralegal earned in Arizona. She also states that other cases filed by her in Arizona and in New Jersey “have never been heard . . . .”<sup>10</sup> The court has carefully considered Ms. Prigge’s motion. It is unclear from the motion, however, what relief she is requesting. In a broad sense it appears she is requesting consultation, but it is unknown with whom she desires a consultation or exactly why such a consultation is necessary. A broad unsupported assertion that the case is “more complex than meets the eye” does not justify a consultation even if it was known with whom Ms. Prigge desires such a consultation.

Accordingly, the court DENIES Ms. Prigge’s Motion for Consultation.

DATED this 13 May 2016.



Brooke C. Wells  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>8</sup> Mtn. p. 1, docket no. 12.

<sup>9</sup> Docket no. 12.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*