

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

STEVEN A. GILLMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 11-3228-RDR

WARDEN C. MAYE,

Respondent.

O R D E R

This petition for writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 was dismissed as moot by Order entered on August 16, 2012. After the Order of Dismissal and Judgment were entered, the clerk received and docketed a Motion for Order apparently submitted by petitioner before he received notice of the dismissal. Respondent has filed a Response to this motion. The court denies petitioner's motion as moot.<sup>1</sup> The request for court action included by respondent in his response is not in proper motion form, but if it were it would likewise be denied as moot.

**IT IS THEREFORE BY THE COURT ORDERED** that petitioner's Motion for Order and Extension of Time (Doc. 21) is denied.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner suggests in his motion that "if the court rules in his favor" he will file a motion for costs. No such motion is before the court and, in any event, petitioner refers to no authority that would entitle him to receive costs in a pro se habeas corpus action.

DATED: This 13<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2012, at Topeka, Kansas.

s/RICHARD D. ROGERS  
United States District Judge