

**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

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.”