

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

Dewey A. Barnett v. Gregory Hancock

Barnett v. Hancock · No. 1:25-cv-00189-SNLJ · Decided May 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri addresses continued filings by Dewey A. Barnett in a closed case. The Court strikes documents 26 and 27, directs the Clerk to reject and return further filings, and warns that continued filings may result in sanctions, including a filing restriction. The Court relies on its inherent authority to restrict abusive or frivolous filings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Southeastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephen N. Limbaugh, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Southeastern Division
DECIDED	May 22, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00189-SNLJ
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After dismissal of Barnett's habeas case and expiration of the time to appeal, the district court addressed Barnett's continued submission of documents in the closed case.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

sanctions civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure habeas corpus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court could strike post-dismissal filings submitted in a closed case.

2. Whether the court could prohibit further filings in the closed case and warn of sanctions, including a filing restriction, based on continued frivolous submissions.

HOLDINGS

1. The court may strike and summarily reject documents filed in a closed case when the filings are unauthorized and serve no legal purpose.
2. Federal courts possess inherent authority to impose filing restrictions on litigants who abuse the judicial process and waste judicial resources through frivolous filings.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal courts have the inherent authority to impose filing restrictions on litigants who abuse the judicial process and waste the Court’s resources with frivolous filings.”

“Every paper filed with the Clerk of this Court, 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.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Barnett continued submitting documents in a case that had already been dismissed and was closed. The post-dismissal filings purported to be verified affidavits offered as evidence, but were not attached to a pleading, motion, memorandum, or response authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the court's local rules. The court found that the filings served no purpose and consumed judicial resources.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was dismissed on March 27, 2026. Barnett continued filing purportedly verified affidavits and other documents after dismissal, including Documents 19 through 22, 26, and 27. The court struck Documents 26 and 27, prohibited further filings in the closed case, and warned that violations could result in sanctions, including a filing restriction.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Tyler, 839 F.2d 1290, 1292-1295 (8th Cir. 1988)
- Day v. Day, 510 U.S. 1, 2 (1993)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION DEWEY A. BARNETT,) Petitioner, Vv. Case No. 1:25-cv-00189-
SNLJ GREGORY HANCOCK, Respondent. MEMORANDUM AND ORDER ☐ This matter is

before the Court to address Barnett's continued filing of documents in this closed case. [Docs. 26, 27]. This case was dismissed on March 27, 2026. [Doc.

[8]. Despite the dismissal, Barnett continues to file documents that serve ☐ no purpose. See [Docs. 19-22, 26, 27]. All of the documents Barnett has filed since the dismissal purport to be "verified" affidavits offered as evidence, The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and this Court's local rules do not authorize the filing of an affidavit or other evidence that is not attached to a complaint, an amended complaint, a motion, a memorandum in support or in opposition to a motion, or a response to a Court order.

Because this case is closed and the time to file an appeal has expired, all further filings submitted by Barnett in this case will be summarily rejected and returned to him by the Clerk of Court. Further, Barnett is warned that continued submission of documents for filing in this closed case without legal authority may result in sanctions, including a filing restriction, Federal courts have the inherent authority to impose filing restrictions on litigants who abuse the judicial process and waste the Court's resources with frivolous filings.

See, *In re Tyler*, 839 F.2d 1290, 1292-1295 (8th Cir. 1988) (upholding imposition of a filing restriction based on frivolous filings). "Every paper filed with the Clerk of this Court, 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." See *Day v. Day*, 510 U.S. 1, 2 (1993) (entering a filing restriction to prevent a pro se petitioner from filing repetitious and frivolous requests).

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that documents 26 and 27 are STRICKEN. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Barnett SHALL NOT submit any documents for filing in this closed case. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that further filings submitted by Barnett in this case will be summarily rejected and returned to him by the Clerk of Court. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE TERMS OF THIS ORDER MAY RESULT IN THE IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

SO ORDERED this ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ of May, 2026. LGB. Janbogl o> STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, JR.
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE