

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

JAN - 7 2019

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Courts for the District of Columbia

ARTHUR N. PUTMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

SENATE JUDICIARY  
COMMITTEE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.: 1: 18-cv-02904 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, two motions to add additional co-defendant, and a motion for emergency hearing. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application [2] and the complaint [1] will be dismissed without prejudice. Plaintiff's motions to add additional co-defendants [3, 4] and the motion for emergency hearing [5] will be denied.

The instant complaint is substantially similar to another filed by plaintiff in a recent lawsuit, *see Putman v. Grassley, et al.*, No. 18-cv-2890 (D.D.C. filed Dec. 10, 2018), and this matter will be dismissed as duplicative.

An Order is issued separately.<sup>1</sup>

Date: January 4, 2019

  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> It has come to the Court's attention that Plaintiff has contacted the Clerk's office on numerous occasions—often in person—demanding that Court staff and personnel immediately respond to his requests and demands. This behavior should not continue. The Court reminds Plaintiff that “part of the Court’s responsibility is to see that [its] resources are allocated in a way that promotes the interests of justice,” *In re McDonald*, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989), and, should this treatment of Court staff continue, the Court may take future action.