

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NO. 06-1517

FRED M. GLOVER,

Appellant

v.

RONNIE HOLT, WARDEN; C.M. MANBACK;
C. BARLOW; U.M. LEONARD

On Appeal From the United States District Court
For the Middle District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civ. No. 05-CV-02059)
District Judge: Honorable William J. Nealon

Submitted For Possible Summary Action Under Third Circuit LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6
August 31, 2006

BEFORE: FUENTES, VAN ANTWERPEN and CHAGARES, CIRCUIT JUDGES

(Filed: September 15, 2006)

OPINION

PER CURIAM

Fred M. Glover appeals from an order of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania (“Middle District Court”), dismissing his petition for

failing to follow a court order. We will summarily affirm the District Court's order, as the appeal presents no substantial issue. I.O.P. 10.6.

Glover filed a petition in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia ("D.C. Court"). The petition stated that he was being held in violation of the laws of the United States. As the petition appeared to be a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, and as Glover is incarcerated in Pennsylvania, the D.C. Court transferred the petition to the Middle District Court. In an order dated October 19, 2005, the Middle District Court noted that Glover's petition "lack[ed] any semblance of clarity," dismissed the petition without prejudice, and afforded Glover 15 days in which to file "an amended petition that clearly indicates the claims Petitioner is attempting to raise." Instead of filing an amended petition, Glover filed only an "opposition" to the order. The Middle District Court dismissed Glover's petition on January 3, 2006, and Glover timely appealed.¹

We have reviewed the petition filed by Glover and agree with the District Court that it lacks "any semblance of clarity." We are unable to discern what Glover's complaint is, and what relief he seeks. The District Court properly gave Glover an opportunity to refile a clarified, amended petition on proper forms, but he failed to do so. We have considered the two responses Glover has filed in this Court, but we find no error

¹ We note that Glover filed a motion for reconsideration, which was denied on March 30, 2006, and filed a document titled "Order Non Feasance," which was denied on August 24 2006. Glover has not appealed these denials.

in the District Court's decision. We will therefore affirm the District Court's order.