

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION**

Jennifer DeAngelis v. State of Missouri, et al.

DeAngelis · No. 4:25-cv-0895-MTS · Decided March 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri dismisses Jennifer DeAngelis's action without prejudice. The court finds that she failed to file her complaint on the required form, properly sign her filings, comply with an order to amend, and update her mailing address.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION JENNIFER DEANGELIS,)) Plaintiff,)) vs.) Case No. 4:25-cv-0895-MTS) STATE OF MISSOURI, et al.,)) Defendants.) MEMORANDUM OPINION There were at least a couple of problems with Plaintiff's case that needed to be addressed. She did not file her Complaint on the Court's provided form, see E.D.

Mo. L.R. 2.06(A), and she did not properly sign her filings, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a); Pack v. City of St. Charles, 4:25-cv-0911-MTS, 2025 WL 2549230, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Sept. 4, 2025). The Court ordered that she address these issues by filing amended documents no later than March 03, 2026. Doc.

[17]. She now has failed to do so and has not sought additional time. What is more, a new problem has arisen. The Court's Order, which the Clerk of Court sent to her at the mailing address she provided, came back as undeliverable by the post office.

Because Plaintiff failed to obey the Court's Order,* has no properly signed pleading, and has failed to update her address, the Court will dismiss her action without prejudice. * It is of no moment if Plaintiff did not receive the Court's Order.

First, she alone is responsible for updating her address with the Court. See E.D. Mo. L.R. 2.06(B). Second, she also has an independent duty to monitor the Court's docket in her case. Shaffer v. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a), the Court will enter herewith an Order of Dismissal that will dismiss this action without prejudice. Dated this 5th day of March 2026.

Th arene T. SCHELP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Lashbrook, 962 F.3d 313, 317 (7th Cir. 2020); Brown v. Zarek, 162 F.3d 1172 (10th Cir. 1998) (per curiam) (table decision); Hall v. Gonfrade, 36 F.3d 1089 (1st Cir. 1994) (per curiam) (table decision). _2-

