

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

Supastar Ware v. Missouri Department of Corrections, et al.

Ware · No. 4:25-cv-00605-JMD · Decided December 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri dismissed Supastar Ware’s action without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to comply with an order directing the filing of an amended complaint. The court also denied all pending motions as moot.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI) SUPASTAR WARE,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) No. 4:25-cv-00605-JMD MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF) CORRECTIONS, et al.,)) Defendants.) MEMORANDUM AND ORDER On September 18, 2025, the Court granted Ware’s motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and directed Ware to file an amended complaint within thirty days.

ECF 16. The Court specifically instructed Ware that any amended complaint must be filed on the Court- provided Prisoner Civil Rights Complaint form and must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court further warned Ware that failure to comply would result in dismissal without prejudice.

As of this date, Ware has not complied with the Court’s order. Although Ware has filed multiple motions, declarations, letters, and attachments since September 18, Ware has not filed an amended complaint. Further, Ware’s motions for leave to amend the complaint— both filed after the Court already granted leave—are procedurally deficient. ECF 19, 23.

Under Local Rule 4.07, “[a] proposed amendment to a pleading or amended pleading itself must be submitted at the time any motion for leave to amend any pleading is filed.” Ware did not submit amended complaints with the motions. Ware’s self-represented status does not eliminate the obligation to follow court orders, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or this Court’s Local Rules.

Burgs v. Sissel, 745 F.2d 526, 528 (8th Cir. 1984) (“Although pro se pleadings are to be construed liberally, pro se litigants are not excused from failing to comply with substantive and procedural law.”). The Court gave Ware clear instructions and ample opportunity for compliance. Ware nevertheless failed to file an amended complaint as ordered.

Accordingly, the Court finds that dismissal is warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to comply with a court order. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without prejudice under Rule 41(b). IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all pending motions are DENIED as moot. A separate Order of Dismissal accompanies this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 19th day of December, 2025. JOSHUA M. DIVINE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE