

ADVIAR, BOEHRINGER INGEL HEIM,
FLOVENT, SINGULAIR MSD,
WARRICK BACHERING, XOPENX,
N.H. BOARD MEDICAL PRACTICE and
VT. MEDICAL BOARD PRACTICE,

12-cv-276-bbc

Defendants.

CHRISTINE PORTER,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

JUDGE CRABB and FLOWVENT,

12-cv-277-bbc

Defendants.

CHRISTINE PORTER,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

US ATTORNEY GENERAL,

12-cv-278-bbc

Defendants.

CHRISTINE PORTER,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

WISCONSIN STATE MEDICAL BOARD,

12-cv-308-bbc

Defendant.

CHRISTINE PORTER,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

JAMES GOODSETT, PAUL HICKS,
PHILIP KURLEY, GUPTA PANKHA,
ROD PETERSON, DR. ROWE,

12-cv-309-bbc

JAMES SEHLOFF and L. WILLIAMS,

Defendants.

CHRISTINE PORTER,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

12-cv-310-bbc

FLOWVENT,

Defendant.

CHRISTINE PORTER,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

12-cv-315-bbc

SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

CHRISTINE PORTER,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

12-cv-316-bbc

JUDGE URBAN,

Defendant.

CHRISTINE PORTER,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

12-cv-317-bbc

DR. JANJOUR, DR. KINCK,
DR. L. WILLIAMS, DR. WILK and
DR. BEDEKAR,

Defendants.

In a May 9, 2012 order, I dismissed each of the above-captioned cases filed by plaintiff Christine Porter because none stated a claim upon which relief could be granted in federal court. Also, to avoid further waste of judicial resources, I directed the clerk of court

to route directly to chambers without docketing any further pleadings plaintiff files in this court in order to verify whether they are comprehensible and raise claims that could be heard in this court. Plaintiff responded by filing a borderline unintelligible motion to reopen the case, which I denied in a June 11, 2012 order.

Now plaintiff has filed another motion to reopen, arguing that “the IRS is involved.” Plaintiff does not explain what the Internal Revenue Service has to do with any of her cases, or why this would rectify the substantial flaws in her complaints. Plaintiff requests also that “judges that were involved” recuse themselves from her cases. However, plaintiff does not explain why I should step aside, and my adverse rulings in these cases are not evidence of bias necessitating recusal. Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994); Golant v. Levy, 239 F.3d 931, 938 (7th Cir. 2001). Accordingly, I will deny plaintiff’s motions to reopen the case and for my recusal.

After a couple of rounds of motions from plaintiff, it is clear that the earlier sanctions were not broad enough to keep plaintiff from continuing to file underdeveloped submissions that consume court resources. Accordingly, I will now direct the clerk of court to route directly to chambers without docketing any further submissions plaintiff files in this court. If a future submission is understandable and raises a fully developed argument that this court has not already rejected in plaintiff’s previous filings, I will return it to the clerk's office with instructions to docket it as appropriate. If the submission suffers from the same problems as her other numerous recent filings, the document will be placed in a miscellaneous file and given no further consideration.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Plaintiff Christine Porter's motions to reopen the above-captioned cases and for my recusal are DENIED.
2. If plaintiff files any new submissions, the clerk of court is directed to send them directly to chambers for review, as explained above.

Entered this 20th day of June, 2012.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge