

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Richmond Division**

**ROBERT SEIFRIED,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Civil Action No. 3:21cv196**

**NURSE HARRIS, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

By Memorandum Order entered on August 27, 2021, the Court directed Seifried to file a particularized complaint within fourteen (14) days of the date of entry hereof. (ECF No. 25.) By Memorandum Order entered on September 17, 2021, and after resistance from Seifried to file a particularized complaint, the Court instructed Seifried to file a particularized complaint within fourteen (14) days of the date of entry thereof.<sup>1</sup> (ECF No. 28.) On October 6, 2021, the Court received a letter from Seifried indicating that he has filed a particularized complaint in all three of his actions. (ECF No. 30, at 1.) By Memorandum Order entered on October 20, 2021, the

---

<sup>1</sup> In that Memorandum Order, the Court explained as follows:

Plaintiff has received three orders because he filed three different civil actions in this Court naming different defendants. He must comply with the orders of the Court in each of the three actions. The Court already pointed out to Plaintiff that he had three actions filed and specifically allowed him to withdraw any of the three actions before the case was filed and money was taken from his account. *See Seifried v. Mack*, No. 3:21CV156 (E.D. Va. filed Mar. 11, 2021, ECF No. 12, at 1 n.1; ECF No. 24, at 2 n.1. Plaintiff insisted that he wanted to proceed with all three cases. Accordingly, money will be taken from his account in each case until he pays the \$350.00 owed for each.

(ECF No. 28, at 1.)

Court explained to Seifried that it had received a particularized complaint in the case *Seifried v. Mack*, No. 3:21cv156 (E.D. Va. filed Sept. 24, 2021), but had not received a particularized complaint in this case. (ECF No. 33, at 1.)

On November 5, 2021, the Court received a Particularized Complaint. (ECF No. 37.) This Particularized Complaint once again listed three civil action numbers on the top despite the Court's warnings that Seifried must file a particularized complaint in each of his three actions. (*See id.* 1.) Moreover, from the Court's review of the Particularized Complaint, it appeared this action may be duplicative of the particularized complaint filed in *Seifried v. Sample*, No. 3:21cv195 (E.D. Va. filed Aug. 20, 2021).<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, by Memorandum Order entered on November 24, 2021, the Court directed Seifried, within fourteen days of the date of entry thereof, to show good cause as to why he should be permitted to litigate a second complaint when he has a similar action pending that has been served on the same Defendants, with the exception of C. O. Coleman. (ECF No. 38.) The Court also explained that **"Seifried must also demonstrate why allowing a second action to proceed at the same time furthers the interest of judicial economy and efficiency."** (*Id.* 3.) The Court noted that if Seifried failed to respond, the Court would dismiss this action and Seifried could continue to litigate his claims in *Seifried v. Sample*, No. 3:21CV195 (E.D. Va. filed Aug. 20, 2021). (*Id.*)

---

<sup>2</sup> The instant action also appeared duplicative of *Seifried v. Mack*, No. 3:21cv156 (E.D. Va. filed Mar. 11, 2021).

More than fourteen days have elapsed, and Seifried has not filed a response to the November 24, 2021 Memorandum Order. Accordingly, the action will be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

An appropriate order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: 1-12-2022  
Richmond, Virginia

/s/   
M. Hannah Lauck  
United States District Judge