

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
JACKSONVILLE DIVISION**

JENNIFER ROYAL BEY, a Natural Person,  
In Propria Persona, Sui Juris (not to be  
confused with nor substituted with Pro Se)  
and not a Statutory Person,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:18-cv-634-J-32JRK

vs.

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY AND  
MOTOR VEHICLES, FLORIDA SUPERIOR  
COURT, STATE OF FLORIDA, and DEPUTY  
JESSE SHOOK, Badge No. 950,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION<sup>1</sup>**

This cause is before the Court sua sponte. Plaintiff initiated this action pro se on May 11, 2018 by filing a document titled “Legal Notice of Removal” (Doc. No. 1) that the Court construes as a Complaint. Plaintiff did not accompany the Complaint with the \$400.00 filing fee or a request to proceed in forma pauperis. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1914(a), 1915(a)(1). On May 16, 2018, the undersigned entered an Order (Doc. No. 2) directing Plaintiff to either (1) complete and file an Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs by June 14, 2018; or (2) pay the \$400.00 filing fee by June 14, 2018. Order at 2.

Plaintiff failed to act by June 14, 2018. Consequently, the undersigned entered an Order to Show Cause (Doc. No. 4) on June 19, 2018, directing Plaintiff to show cause by July

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> “Within 14 days after being served with a copy of [a report and recommendation on a dispositive issue], a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). “A party may respond to another party’s objections within 14 days after being served with a copy.” Id. A party’s failure to serve and file specific objections to the proposed findings and recommendations alters the scope of review by the District Judge and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, including waiver of the right to challenge anything to which no specific objection was made. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); 11th Cir. R. 3-1; Local Rule 6.02.

18, 2018 as to why the undersigned should not recommend dismissal of the matter for failure to prosecute. See Order to Show Cause at 1-2. Plaintiff was advised that the document she filed on June 18, 2018 (Doc. No. 3) does not provide the financial information necessary for the Court to determine whether she should be permitted to proceed in forma pauperis. Id. at 2 n. 1. Plaintiff was also directed to comply with the May 16, 2018 Order by July 18, 2018. Id. at 2. Plaintiff was warned that failure to respond by July 18, 2018 could result in a recommendation of dismissal without further notice. Id.

To date, Plaintiff has not responded in any way to the June 19, 2018 Order to Show Cause, and she has not complied with the May 16, 2018 Order. Accordingly, it is

**RECOMMENDED:**

1. That this case be **DISMISSED without prejudice** for failure to prosecute pursuant to Rule 3.10(a), Local Rules, United States District Court, Middle District of Florida.
2. That the Clerk of Court be directed to terminate all pending motions and close the file.

**RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDED** at Jacksonville, Florida on July 26, 2018.

  
JAMES R. KLINDT  
United States Magistrate Judge

bhc  
Copies to:

Honorable Timothy J. Corrigan  
United States District Judge

Pro se party