

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | CRIMINAL ACTION |
| v. |) | |
| |) | No. 12-20141-18-KHV |
| CHRISTOPHER CRAIG, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on defendant’s pro se Bar Complaint And Motion For Sanctions Against AUSA Sheri McCracken (Doc. #387) filed August 30, 2013. The Court overrules defendant’s pro se motion because he is represented by counsel who did not sign the motion. See United States v. Sandoval-DeLao, 283 Fed. Appx. 621, 625 (10th Cir. 2008) (no error in refusal to consider pro se motion when defendant represented by counsel); United States v. Castellon, 218 Fed. Appx. 775, 780 (10th Cir. 2007) (if criminal defendant represented by counsel, court does not accept pro se filings or allegations); United States v. McKinley, 58 F.3d 1475, 1480 (10th Cir. 1995) (no constitutional right to “hybrid form of representation”). In any event, defendant has not shown that sanctions against government counsel are appropriate in this case.¹

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant’s pro se Bar Complaint And Motion For Sanctions Against AUSA Sheri McCracken (Doc. #387) filed August 30, 2013 be and hereby is **OVERRULED**.

¹ To the extent that defendant seeks to file a formal complaint, he may direct his complaint to Stanton A. Hazlett, Disciplinary Administrator, Kansas Board for Discipline of Attorneys, 701 SW Jackson Street, 1st Floor, Topeka, Kansas 66603-3729.

Dated this 23rd day of October, 2013 at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Kathryn H. Vratil
Kathryn H. Vratil
United States District Judge