

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, ORLANDO DIVISION

Timothy W. Morris v. National Aeronautics and Space
Administration

Morris · No. 6:26-cv-234-CEM-LHP · Decided February 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida grants Timothy W. Morris an extension until March 24, 2026, to comply with the presiding judge’s Initial Order. The court denies without prejudice his motion to add the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as a party for failure to provide supporting legal authority and directs him to pay the filing fee or submit a completed in forma pauperis application by the same deadline.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Leslie Hoffman Price
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
DECIDED	February 24, 2026
DOCKET	6:26-cv-234-CEM-LHP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed two motions: one seeking an extension of deadlines and seeking to add the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as a party or respondent, and a second motion seeking to add the EEOC. The court granted an extension, denied the first motion's request to add the EEOC as moot, and denied the second motion without prejudice for failure to comply with the local rule requiring a supporting memorandum.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Timothy W. Morris v. National Aeronautics and Space Administration

TOPICS

civil procedure

motion to amend

federal employment law

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal employment law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff should receive an extension of the deadlines in the presiding district judge's Initial Order.
2. Whether the plaintiff's request to add the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as a party or respondent should be denied as moot or without prejudice for failure to comply with Local Rule 3.01(b).
3. Whether the plaintiff must pay the filing fee or file a completed application to proceed in forma pauperis by the court-ordered deadline.

HOLDINGS

1. The plaintiff was granted an extension through and including March 24, 2026, to comply with the requirements of the presiding district judge's Initial Order.
2. The portion of the first motion seeking to add the EEOC as a party or respondent was denied as moot because the plaintiff filed a second motion seeking the same relief.
3. The second motion to add the EEOC was denied without prejudice because it failed to include a memorandum of legal authority as required by Local Rule 3.01(b).
4. The plaintiff was ordered to file a completed and signed long-form application to proceed in forma pauperis or pay the entire filing fee by March 24, 2026.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Any renewed motion must comply in full with all applicable Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.”

“Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to comply with this Order may result in dismissal of this case without further notice.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Timothy W. Morris filed two motions while proceeding without counsel. The first motion appeared to seek an extension of deadlines in the district judge's Initial Order and also sought to add the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as a party or respondent. The second motion sought the same addition but did not include a memorandum of legal authority, and Morris had neither paid the filing fee in this court nor filed a proper motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter was pending in the Middle District of Florida after transfer from the Federal Circuit. No defendant had appeared. The court resolved the plaintiff's two motions and directed him to file an in forma pauperis

application or pay the filing fee by March 24, 2026.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Moon v. Newsome, 863 F.2d 835, 836 (11th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 863 (1989)

OPINION

Morris

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

ORLANDO DIVISION

TIMOTHY W. MORRIS,

Petitioner, v. Case No: 6:26-cv-234-CEM-LHP

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND

SPACE ADMINISTRATION,

Respondent

ORDER

(And Direction to Clerk) Before the Court are two motions filed by Plaintiff Timothy W. Morris, proceeding pro se. Doc. Nos. 5-6. While somewhat unclear, it appears that the first motion is requesting an extension “to all motions issued 1/30/26.” Doc. No.

5. However, the only motions filed in this case are from Plaintiff, and no

Defendant has yet appeared in this case. Rather, it seems that Plaintiff is seeking an extension of the deadlines set forth in the Presiding District Judge’s Initial Order. Doc. No. 2. To the extent the motion is seeking such relief, the motion is GRANTED, and the deadline for Plaintiff to comply with the requirements of that Order (Doc. No. 2) is extended up to and including March 24, 2026. The motion is also requesting to add the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”) as a party/respondent to the case. Doc. No. 5. That portion of the motion (Doc. No. 5) is DENIED AS MOOT as Plaintiff has filed a second motion requesting the same relief, discussed next. The second motion filed by Plaintiff is the aforementioned request to add the EEOC as a party/respondent. Doc. No. 6. The motion appears to be photocopy of a document filed in the Federal Circuit, along with handwritten notations that Plaintiff asked the Federal Circuit to add the EEOC prior the transfer of this case to this Court. Id. Upon consideration, the motion (Doc. No. 6) is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to provide a memorandum of legal authority in support of the requested relief as required by Local Rule 3.01(b). Any renewed motion must comply in full with all applicable Local Rules and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Moon v.

Newsome, 863 F.2d 835, 836 (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). The Court also notes that Plaintiff has not filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis or paid the filing fee in this Court.¹ Accordingly, on or before March 24, 2026, Plaintiff is ORDERED to either file a motion for leave to proceed in 1 Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis before the Federal Circuit, but that motion is not before this Court and is in any event deficient. Doc. No. 1- 3, at 29-32. forma pauperis by filing a completed and signed Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (Long Form) or pay the entire filing fee. Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to comply with this Order may result in dismissal of this case without further notice. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f); Rule 3.10. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to mail a copy of the Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (Long Form) to Plaintiff, along with a copy of this Order.” DONE and ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on February 24, 2026.

LESLIE NOFFMAN PRICE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to: Unrepresented Parties 2 The Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Costs (Long Form) is also available on the Court’s website, <https://www.flmd.uscourts.gov/>, by selecting “For Litigants,” and “Litigants Without Lawyers,” and then selecting “Forms.”