

GREGORY S. HOLLISTER,
Plaintiff,
v.
BARRY SOETORO, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Instead of the opposition plaintiff was ordered to file by 2/13/09 (or defendants' motion to dismiss would be granted as conceded, see [#10]), what plaintiff filed was (a) the affidavit of a paralegal (who works in the office of a Pennsylvania lawyer who has not been admitted to practice in this Court), complaining about her treatment by an employee of the Clerk's Office, and (b) many blank pages, decorated only by what appear to be botanical drawings and the illegible photocopy of an Hawaiian certificate of live birth. (a) The affidavit was apparently intended as a response to my earlier observation that plaintiff's motion to file interpleader was frivolous, see [#2], [#10], the argument being, "Maureen Higgins made me do it." What was frivolous about the motion, however, was not the fact that it was filed, but the suggestion that "duties" could be filed in the registry of this court. (b) The blank pages were either somebody's idea of a joke (in which case I don't get it) or a mistake. If the latter, plaintiffs have until 5:00 pm EST on

2/26/09 to correct it, by re-filing their points and authorities in opposition to the pending motion to dismiss (in the .pdf format required by the Court's CM/EDF system), or otherwise to show cause why that motion should not now be granted as conceded. It is **SO ORDERED**.

JAMES ROBERTSON
United States District Judge