

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Clarence O. REYNOLDS,	:
Plaintiff	:
	:
-vs-	: Civ. No. 3:04cv218 (PCD)
	:
Richard S. BLUMENTHAL, et. al.,	:
Defendants	:

RULING ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE COMPLAINT and ORDER

Pursuant to Local Rule 16(g)(2), Defendants Allan B. Taylor and Defendants Connecticut Light & Power Company, Northeast Nuclear Energy Co, and Northeast Utilities Service Company move to strike the complaint from the docket [see Doc. Nos. 6, 8, and 17] because attorney Nancy Burton, who signed the complaint, is the subject of contempt orders in the United States District Court. On April 6, 2004, this Court issued an Order to Show Cause as to why the complaint should not be stricken [Doc. No. 20]. Familiarity with the Order is presumed.

The docket reflects that Plaintiff Clarence Reynolds has filed a pro se appearance [Doc. No. 7], thereby precluding dismissal on the grounds stated by Defendant.

In the absence of payment of the sanctions ordered by Judge Nevas, pursuant to Local Rule 16(g)(2) Attorney Burton is foreclosed from filing any pleadings in this Court. D. CONN. L. CIV. R. 16(g)(2) (“[t]he Clerk shall not accept for filing any paper from an attorney or pro se litigant against whom a final order of monetary sanctions has been imposed until the sanctions have been paid in full”). Consequently, the appearance of Attorney Burton is hereby ORDERED stricken. Burton is hereby ORDERED to not function, in any capacity, as an attorney with respect to this case.

Plaintiff Reynolds is ORDERED to proceed in accordance with Local Rule 26(f), the Supplemental Order [Doc. No. 21], and the Order on Pretrial Deadlines [Doc. No. 2]. The

docket reflects that the deadline for discovery is August 10, 2004, and the deadline for dispositive motions is September 9, 2004 [Doc. No. 2].

In light of this Ruling and Order, Burton is ORDERED to supply Plaintiff Reynolds with copies of all pleadings filed in this case to date. Plaintiff Reynolds is hereby ORDERED to file a response to the current pending motions on or before May 28, 2004.¹

Defendants' Motions to Strike Complaint [Doc. Nos. 6, 8, and 17] are **granted in part** and **denied in part** as discussed above. Plaintiff's motion for extension of time [Doc. No. 25], premised on scheduling conflicts of Attorney Burton, is **denied** as moot.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, May 3, 2004.

/s/

Peter C. Dorsey
United States District Judge

¹ The following pending motions survive this Ruling: Defendant Day, Berry & Howard's Motion for Interim Relief from Rule 83.13 [Doc. No. 5], and Defendants Attorney General Richard Blumenthal, Assistant Attorney General Mark Kohler, and the Connecticut Department of Public Utility's Motion to Dismiss [Doc. No. 11].