

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION**

KENT E. HOVIND, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 3:20-cv-5484-TKW/MJF

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter is before this court on Plaintiffs’ “Motion for Access to Pacer CM/ECF,” (Doc. 16). Plaintiffs proceeding *pro se*, requests permission to have access to electronic filing privileges because they are “parties to the suit.” (*Id.* at 1).

The Local Rules for the Northern District of Florida provide that

Unless the Court orders otherwise, every document submitted for filing must be submitted through the electronic filing system, not in hard copy or by facsimile or other means, except that [a pro se party’s] documents may—and if so required by an administrative order or an order in a case must—be filed in hard copy.

N.D. Fla. Loc. R. 5.4(A)(3).

While the undersigned has not entered an order in this case regarding electronic filing, the courts in this district generally do not to permit *pro se* parties to file documents electronically. One of the reasons for prohibiting *pro se* parties

from filing documents electronically is because *pro se* parties are not familiar with the rules of the court and with the procedures for electronically filing documents. Upon a finding of good cause, however, courts in this district have granted *pro se* parties the privilege of electronic filing. *See e.g., Walker v. Progressive Select Ins. Co.*, 1:19-cv-182-AW/GRJ (N.D. Fla. Oct. 11, 2019) (Doc. 8 at 2) (granting motion when plaintiff showed good cause for e-filing privileges by indicating that he has reviewed the court’s requirement for e-filing); *Wick v. Citigroup, Inc.*, 3:10-cv-358-MCR/EMT (N.D. Fla. Jan. 5, 2016) (granting motion for good cause because *pro se* plaintiff was “a retired attorney fully equipped to engage in electronic filing and has an understanding of the Court’s electronic filing system through his years of practice as an active attorney”).

Here, Plaintiffs have not provided any reasons or facts for this court to deviate from the normal practice of having *pro se* litigants submit their documents via hard copy. To the extent that they argue that they should have access because they are parties, all copies of the court’s orders will be mailed to Plaintiffs. Thus, they will each receive a copy of the court’s orders.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

Plaintiffs’ “Motion for Access to Pacer CM/ECF,” (Doc. 16), is **DENIED** without prejudice.

SO ORDERED this 1st day of February, 2021.

/s/ Michael J. Frank

Michael J. Frank

United States Magistrate Judge