

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
ORLANDO DIVISION

DIANSKY ROUZARD,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 6:24-cv-585-CEM-LHP

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL  
SECURITY,

Defendant

---

**ORDER**

This cause came on for consideration without oral argument on the following motion filed herein:

**MOTION: MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND SUMMARY  
DEFAULT JUDGMENT (Doc. No. 32)**

**FILED: July 11, 2024**

---

**THEREON it is ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.**

The above-styled motion is a duplicate copy of a previously-filed motion that has already been ruled upon by the Court. *Compare* Doc. No. 32, *with* Doc. No. 28; *see also* Doc. No. 29. Accordingly, the above-styled motion (Doc. No. 32) is **DENIED** for the same reasons previously set forth. *See* Doc. No. 29.

Plaintiff is cautioned that status as a *pro se* litigant does not excuse a party from compliance with all applicable Court Orders, Local Rules, and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (a *pro se* litigant “is subject to the relevant law and rules of court, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.”), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 863 (1989). Plaintiff is further cautioned that future filings that fail to comply with all Court Orders, Local Rules, and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will be stricken or summarily denied without further notice, and may subject Plaintiff to sanctions.

**DONE and ORDERED** in Orlando, Florida on July 15, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LESLIE HOFFMAN PRICE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record  
Unrepresented Parties