

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

KEITH RUSSELL JUDD,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	NO. CIV-11-624-D
)	
OKLAHOMA STATE ELECTION BOARD,)	
et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s August 3, 2012 Motion for Relief from Judgment [Doc. No. 34] in which he seeks relief from the July 30, 2012 Judgment [Doc. No. 33] entered herein following the Order [Doc. No. 32] dismissing this case without prejudice. Also before the Court is a separate Motion [Doc. No. 38], filed on August 23, 2012, which is identical to the earlier motion.

The August 3, 2012 Motion [Doc. No. 32] is denied. The judgment [Doc. No. 33] from which Plaintiff purports to seek relief is a judgment dismissing this action without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to respond to the Court’s Order denying his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and directing payment of the filing fee required to proceed with this action. In the current motion, Plaintiff fails to address any of the bases for the Order and the subsequent Judgment. Instead, he asserts arguments having nothing to do with the requirements for *in forma pauperis* status or the findings set out in the July 30, 2012 Order and subsequent Judgment. The August 23, 2012 Motion [Doc. No. 38] is stricken, as it is merely a duplicate of the August 3, 2012 Motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 1st day of October, 2012.

TIMOTHY D. DEGIUSTI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE