

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, FORT WAYNE DIVISION

Ted B. Jones v. IMPD, et al.

Jones v. IMPD · No. 1:25-CV-653-HAB-ALT · Decided March 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana dismissed Ted B. Jones’s case with prejudice after he failed to comply with an order requiring a properly completed complaint and continued submitting noncompliant filings. The court denied his pending motions to proceed in forma pauperis and for appointed counsel, imposed a two-year filing restriction subject to specified exceptions, and warned that attempts to circumvent the restriction could result in fines or more severe restrictions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Holly A. Brady
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne Division
DECIDED	March 6, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-CV-653-HAB-ALT
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se plaintiff failed to comply with an order requiring a properly completed civil complaint form and an amended complaint containing only related claims. The district court denied pending in forma pauperis and counsel motions, dismissed the action with prejudice, and imposed a filing restriction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Ted B. Jones v. IMPD, et al.

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed because the plaintiff failed to comply with the court's order requiring a proper amended complaint.
2. Whether the plaintiff's repeated frivolous and noncompliant filings justified restricting his ability to file papers in the district court.
3. Whether the plaintiff's pending motions to proceed in forma pauperis and for appointment of counsel should be denied.

HOLDINGS

1. A plaintiff's failure to comply with an order requiring a proper amended complaint, after being warned that noncompliance would result in dismissal, warranted dismissal of the case with prejudice.
2. A district court may restrict a litigant's future filings when repeated frivolous or noncompliant filings, despite prior admonitions, waste judicial resources and demonstrate continued disregard of court orders.
3. The court denied Jones's pending motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and for appointment of counsel.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Every paper filed . . . no matter how repetitious or frivolous, requires some portion of the institution’s limited resources. A part of the Court’s responsibility is to see that these resources are allocated in a way that promotes the interests of justice.” (362 F.3d at 957)

“That time has come. Jones has been repeatedly admonished that he would be restricted if he continued to make frivolous filings.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jones was instructed to submit a properly and legibly completed civil complaint form and an amended complaint containing only related claims. He failed to comply by the deadline and filed six additional illegible letters, each of which was stricken. The court also considered Jones's history of repeated frivolous or noncompliant filings and prior warnings that continued frivolous filings could result in filing restrictions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 6, 2026, the court ordered Jones to submit a legible civil complaint form and an amended complaint limited to related claims by February 5, 2026. Jones did not comply and instead filed six additional illegible, nonresponsive letters, which the court struck. Relying on his repeated disregard of court orders and prior warnings, the court dismissed this case with prejudice and restricted his ability to file papers in the court, subject to specified exceptions and a two-year period before seeking removal of the restriction.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Jones v. Reno, et al., No. 1:94-CV-240-WCL
- Jones v. Fort Wayne City of, et al., No. 1:96-CV-484-WCL
- Jones v. Fort Wayne IN, et al., No. 1:97-CV-465-WCL
- Jones v. Stoner, et al., No. 1:03-CV-303-TLS-RBC
- Jones v. Indy City of, et al., No. 1:12-CV-111-RL-RBC
- Jones v. Majestic Care Ctr., No. 1:24-CV-111-HAB-SLC
- Jones v. CitiLink Bus, No. 1:25-CV-352-HAB-ALT
- Jones v. Parkview Hospital, et al., No. 1:25-CV-372-HAB-ALT
- Montgomery v. Davis, 362 F.3d 956, 957 (7th Cir. 2004)
- In re McDonald, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989)

OPINION

I.M.P.D.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

FORT WAYNE DIVISION

TED B. JONES,

Plaintiff,

v. CASE NO. 1:25-CV-653-HAB-ALT

IMPD, et al., Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

On January 6, 2026, the Court instructed pro se Plaintiff Ted Jones to return a properly (and legibly) completed Civil Complaint Form with an amended complaint containing only related claims. (ECF No. 22). Jones was warned that failure to follow that Order by February 5, 2026, would result in a dismissal of this case, and that any further filings non-responsive to the Order would be stricken as non-compliant. (Id. at 5). Now, two months have passed and not only has Jones failed to follow this Court's prior Order, he has continued on his frivolous-filing escapade by writing six more illegible letters to the Court, each of which has been stricken as non-compliant. See ECF Nos. 25, 26, 29, 33, 34, 36. Because he has failed to comply with this Court's Order, this case will be dismissed. Jones is a known frequent litigant in the Northern District of Indiana. He has been filing suits since the last century—with four in the last two years—and each case was dismissed in the earliest stages as legally frivolous, failing to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, failing to allege any cause of action over which this Court has subject matter

jurisdiction, or else failure to comply with the Court's prior orders. See *Jones v. Reno, et al.*, No. 1:94-CV-240-WCL; *Jones v. Fort Wayne City of, et al.*, No. 1:96-CV-484-WCL; *Jones v. Fort Wayne IN, et al.*, No. 1:97-CV-465-WCL; *Jones v. Stoner, et al.*, No. 1:03-CV-303-TLS-RBC; *Jones v. Indy City of, et al.*, No. 1:12-CV-111-RL-RBC; *Jones v. Majestic Care Ctr.*, No. 1:24-CV-111-HAB-SLC; *Jones v. CitiLink Bus*, No. 1:25-CV-352-HAB-ALT; *Jones v. Parkview Hospital, et al.*, No. 1:25-CV- 372-HAB-ALT. Some of these suits have had overlapping or even repeated facts or claims—as best the Court can tell, the instant suit attempts to rehash many of the allegations Jones has lodged in prior cases either in this Court or the Southern District of Indiana. Most recently, Jones's two other suits filed in 2025 were dismissed for failure to comply with the Court's orders to either pay the filing fee or file a motion to proceed IFP. But dismissal apparently has not deterred Jones from continuing to badger the Court. In each of the other 2025 cases Jones filed not one, not two, but three handwritten requests to reopen the case. All six requests were denied as the rambling filings included—and the Court could find— no justification to grant him such relief. And in the Court's most recent order in both cases, the undersigned cautioned Jones that further frivolous filings could result in the Court restricting his ability to make filings. See *Ted B. Jones v. CitiLink Bus*, No. 1:25-CV-352, ECF No. 25 at 2 (N.D. Ind. Jan. 14, 2026); *Jones v. Parkview Hospital, et al.*, No. 1:25-CV-372, ECF No. 21 at 2 (N.D. Ind. Jan. 14, 2026). Jones was warned: To reiterate what has already been said in previous orders, Jones's case was dismissed because he did not pay the filing fee or move to have it waived. If Jones thinks the Court erred in dismissing the case, he can appeal that decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. What he cannot do is keep coming back to this Court asking for more bites at the apple without addressing the issue that got his case dismissed in the first place. None of this prevents him from filing a new complaint using the proper forms that he has been provided which states a claim that this Court can hear. But if he continues to flout this Court's orders, the Court may be left with no choice but to restrict his ability to make future filings. *Id.* That time has come. Jones has been repeatedly admonished that he would be restricted if he continued to make frivolous filings. Those warnings have not deterred him, and his conduct has continued to waste limited judicial resources. See *Montgomery v. Davis*, 362 F.3d 956, 957 (7th Cir. 2004) (“Every paper filed . . . no matter how repetitious or frivolous, requires some portion of the institution's limited resources. A part of the Court's responsibility is to see that these resources are allocated in a way that promotes the interests of justice.” (quoting *In re McDonald*, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989))). For these reasons, the Court:

- (1) DENIES Jones's pending Motions for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (ECF Nos. 12, 13, 15) and Motions to Appoint Counsel (ECF Nos. 10, 16);
- (2) DISMISSES this case with prejudice;
- (3) RESTRICTS Ted B. Jones¹ from filing any paper in this Court including the filing of any new case (except a notice of appeal in this case, any case/motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 or § 2255, or filing in any federal criminal proceeding against him);

(4) GRANTS Jones leave to seek to remove this restriction after it has been in place for two years; and

(5) ADMONISHES Jones that if he attempts to circumvent this or any other restriction order, he may be fined or subjected to more severe restrictions. SO ORDERED this 6th day of March 2026. s/Holly A. Brady

CHIEF JUDGE HOLLY A. BRADY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 The Court is aware that Jones sometimes signs his name as “Teddie Jones,” “Ted Belcher,” “Ted Washington,” or some combination of the three. The filing restriction will apply to him no matter which name he attempts to use.