

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

MICHAEL L. BUESGENS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 17-MC-51-JPS

MICHELLE JACOBS, SUSAN
KNEPEL, BRIAN PAWLAK, U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, ALAN
C. OLSON, JENNIFER ALLEN, and
ALAN C. OLSON & ASSOCIATES,

Defendants.

ORDER

On June 20, 2007, District Judge Sam Sparks of the Western District of Texas entered a nationwide injunction against further case filings by Plaintiff without leave of the court in which the action was to be filed. (Docket #2). Judge Sparks issued the injunction in light of Plaintiff's unrelenting campaign of frivolous filings across the country. *Id.* This District has not been immune to Plaintiff's litigiousness either. Both this Court and Magistrate Judge David E. Jones have been forced to deal with nonsensical motions to intervene, where Plaintiff seeks to inject himself in lawsuits which have nothing to do with him. *See Stacy L. Ellis v. Henry M. Paulson, Jr. et al.*, Case No. 08-CV-436-JPS, (Docket #58) (E.D. Wis. Aug. 23, 2017); *Jamesetta McFarland-Lawson v. U.S. Dep't of Hous. and Urban Dev. et al.*, Case No. 16-CV-685-DEJ, (Docket #41) (E.D. Wis. Oct. 25, 2017). Indeed, Magistrate Jones sanctioned Plaintiff, expressly imposing Judge Sparks' pre-approval requirement for any future filings in this District.

Plaintiff at least facially attempted to comply with the pre-approval requirement in a filing from October 6, 2017, which the Clerk of the Court docketed as this miscellaneous civil action. (Docket #1). However, Plaintiff's proposed complaint deals with Stacy Ellis ("Ellis"), one of the plaintiffs in whose case he had previously tried to intervene. The confused complaint targets alleged misconduct directed at Ellis and has nothing to do with Plaintiff. The complaint is, in fact, a thinly-veiled attempt to obtain the relief he sought in his motion to intervene in the Ellis case. *See Ellis*, Case No. 08-CV-436-JPS, (Docket #53) (Plaintiff's motion to intervene). Despite being told repeatedly by courts in this District that he cannot intervene in cases in which he has no interest, Plaintiff continues this behavior unabated. Plaintiff's request for leave to file his complaint will be denied, and this action will be closed. The Court warns him that any future frivolous filings may be met with monetary sanctions.


Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's request for leave to file a complaint (Docket #1) be and the same is hereby **DENIED**; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action be and the same is hereby **DISMISSED**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 31st day of January, 2018.

BY THE COURT:



J. P. Stadtmueller
U.S. District Judge