

**FILED**  
**United States Court of Appeals**  
**Tenth Circuit**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

**April 11, 2023**

**Christopher M. Wolpert**  
**Clerk of Court**

COLBY JEROME HALE-EL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

REIGENBORN, Sheriff; MIKE EASON;  
BRIAN S. MASON,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 22-1437  
(D.C. No. 1:22-CV-02624-LTB)  
(D. Colo.)

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT\***

Before **BACHARACH, KELLY, and MORITZ**, Circuit Judges.\*\*

Plaintiff-Appellant, Colby Jerome Hale-El, a detainee at the Adams County Detention Facility, seeks to appeal from the district court’s order dismissing his action without prejudice for failure to comply with court orders to cure filing deficiencies. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). These deficiencies include failing to submit an inmate account statement, clarifying his address of record, and indicating whether he is pursuing civil rights or habeas corpus claims. R. 106–07.

\* This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

\*\* After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument.

We review a district court’s order dismissing a complaint for failing to comply with a court order for an abuse of discretion. Nasious v. Two Unknown B.I.C.E. Agents, 492 F.3d 1158, 1161 (10th Cir. 2007). We construe pro se pleadings liberally, but pro se parties must still follow the rules of procedure that govern other litigants. Garrett v. Selby Connor Maddux & Janer, 425 F.3d 836, 840 (10th Cir. 2005). We “cannot take on the responsibility of serving as the litigant’s attorney in constructing arguments and searching the record.” Id. A pro se appellant is responsible for informing the court where a district court has erred and that requires addressing the grounds on which a challenged ruling depends. See id. at 840–41. On appeal, Mr. Hale-El relies upon the notice of removal (from local proceedings) and the pleadings which began this action claiming that he is protected by the Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Morocco and the United States. He also raises federal constitutional defenses and Colorado statutory defenses. He seeks dismissal of pending charges and compensatory and punitive damages for each person listed in his notice of removal.

We find no abuse of discretion in the district court’s dismissal without prejudice and therefore affirm. We deny Mr. Hale-El’s motion to proceed IFP, as he has not provided “a reasoned, nonfrivolous argument on the law and facts in support of the issues raised on appeal,” DeBardleben v. Quinlan, 937 F.2d 502, 505 (10th Cir. 1991), and we direct him to pay any remaining unpaid balance of the appellate

filing fee. Finally, we deny all pending motions, including those for injunctive relief or a temporary restraining order.

Entered for the Court

Paul J. Kelly, Jr.  
Circuit Judge