

**Multi-Action Order**2:26-cv-02110-JEH-RLHOsterbur v. United States of  
America

16,70,PROSE,REFER

U.S. District Court

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 5/12/2026 at 12:18 PM CDT and filed on 5/12/2026

**Case Name:** Osterbur v. United States of America**Case Number:** 2:26-cv-02110-JEH-RLH**Filer:****WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 05/12/2026****Document Number:** 5(No document attached)**Docket Text:**

**TEXT ORDER:** On 4/24/2026, the Magistrate Judge indicated that a review of the *pro se* Plaintiff's [1] Complaint raised a few threshold concerns. First, the Complaint failed to set forth a "short and plain statement" of both the grounds for the Court's jurisdiction and "the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief" as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1)-(2). Nor did the Complaint set forth any cognizable legal claims or make a coherent demand for a legal remedy. Also, the Court noted that while the United States and the State of Illinois were listed as Defendants, those Defendants are generally immune from suit. The Magistrate Judge ordered the Plaintiff to show cause in writing, no later than 5/8/2026, why this case should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. On 5/6/2026, the Plaintiff filed not one but two [3], [4] Responses. The Court has reviewed those Responses which are a continuation of the Plaintiffs Complaint: rambling, lengthy, incoherent, and repetitive, among other shortcomings. Rather than provide a short and plain statement of the grounds for this Court's jurisdiction and a claim showing he is entitled to relief, the Plaintiff instead makes sweeping and exceptionally general arguments about several unrelated topics. While a court must construe a *pro se* plaintiff's complaint liberally, *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007), this particular Plaintiff is no stranger to litigation. He previously filed 11 cases in this district, his cases were several times against either the United States or State of Illinois, and his cases were repeatedly dismissed for lack of subject jurisdiction or failure to state a claim or for being wholly insubstantial or frivolous. In fact, in July 2011, a judge in this district *sua sponte* enjoined the Plaintiff from filing any further lawsuits, motions, or pleadings in the Urbana Division of this district unless filed through counsel and directed the Clerk to return unfiled any papers the Plaintiff attempted to file that did not comply with that particular order. *Osterbur v. State of Illinois Governor P. Quinn*, No. 2:11-cv-02111-HAB-DGB (C.D. Ill. July 20, 2011) (Baker, J.). Another judge in this district, the very next day in July 2011, noted what a frequent filer the Plaintiff was and that all his complaints except for one, were dismissed for the reasons mentioned herein lack of subject matter jurisdiction, failure to state a claim, etcetera. *Osterbur v. Federal Bureau of Investigation*, No. 2:10-cv-02277-MPM-DGB (C.D. Ill. July 21, 2011) (McCuskey, J.) (noting the filing restriction Judge Baker imposed, further enjoining Osterbur from filing any further lawsuits, motions, or pleadings in *all* divisions other