

ELECTRONIC RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS, filed 3/28/13 (Dkt. #211) AND ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS, filed 4/25/13 (Dkt. #212) in BOOK V. TOBIN, 04 CV 442 (JBA)

5/13/13 – The factual and procedural history behind this nine-year-old litigation is set forth in the various published opinions in this case, namely Book v. Tobin, 2005 WL 1981803 (D. Conn. Aug. 16, 2005)(granting defendants' Motion to Dismiss), aff'd, 263 Fed. Appx. 174 (2d Cir. 2008), cert. denied, 555 U.S. 1105, reh. denied, 129 S. Ct. 1692 (2009), 2010 WL 4436037 (D. Conn. Nov. 1, 2010)(denying plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration and Articulation), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 293, reh. denied, 132 S. Ct. 806 (2011), 2012 WL 2190740 (D. Conn. June 14, 2012)(denying plaintiff's Motion to Reopen Judgment of Court Rulings). In her June 2012 Ruling, Judge Arterton recounted the numerous times that the Second Circuit, this district court, the Connecticut Appellate Court and the Connecticut Superior Court barred plaintiff from any additional filings without court permission, 2012 WL 2190740, at \*2 & n.1. The June 2012 Ruling held:

Plaintiff is hereby warned that this case is closed and must remain so as previously explained. If Mr. Book continues to burden this Court with frivolous motions seeking reconsideration of this disposition, an injunction will be issued directing the Clerk of this Court to refuse to accept for filing any submissions from him, unless he first obtains leave of the Court to file each pleading sought to be filed.

Id. at \*2. Immediately thereafter, plaintiff filed two additional motions (Dkts. ##204-05), at which time Judge Arterton ordered that "THE CLERK IS HEREBY DIRECTED TO REFUSE ANY FUTURE SUBMISSIONS FROM PLAINTIFF IN THIS CASE WITHOUT PRIOR LEAVE OF THE COURT FOR EACH PLEADING SOUGHT TO BE FILED." (Dkt.#206) (emphasis in original). Following plaintiff's appeal (Dkts. ##207-08), on February 13, 2013, the Second Circuit directed plaintiff to either file a Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis, or pay the filing fees within fourteen days of the court order. (Dkts. ##209-10).

Plaintiff's motions (Dkts. ##211-12) are denied, in that they simply rehash issues that have been put to rest on multiple occasions in the far past, in this lawsuit or in his myriad other lawsuits, or simply have nothing to do with any issue here.