

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

7 DAVID TROUPE,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 CHARLES PEASE, et al.,

11 Defendants.

No. 4:15-CV-05090-EFS

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS**

12  
13 Before the Court are David Troupe's Motion for Protective Order  
14 and Transfer, ECF No. 45; Motion to Compel WSP, ECF No. 47; and Motion  
15 for Protective Order, ECF No. 60. On November 7, 2016, the Court held  
16 a pretrial conference in one of Plaintiff's other lawsuits, case  
17 number 2:13-CV-05038-EFS (Case 5038). At the hearing, the Court heard  
18 argument and made rulings on various issues that Plaintiff also raises  
19 in this matter. Having conducted that hearing, and having reviewed  
20 the parties' submissions, the Court is fully informed. The Court  
21 denies Plaintiff's motions for the reasons set forth below.

22 **I. MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND TRANSFER (ECF NO. 45)**

23 Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order and Transfer, ECF No.  
24 45, raises issues outside the scope of this case. Plaintiff also  
25 fails to demonstrate any interference with his ability to pursue this  
26 case. The Court therefore denies Plaintiff's motion.

1 **A. Request for Protective Orders**

2 Plaintiff requests that the Court issue a protective order  
3 against Jason Kaehlor, William Hale, and Anthony Gonzalez to prevent  
4 physical contact, verbal contact, being within 100 feet, and contact  
5 with Plaintiff's legal work. ECF No. 45. As a preliminary matter, the  
6 Court notes that Plaintiff's motion lacks any allegations as to Jason  
7 Kaehlor. The Court therefore finds no basis to issue a protective  
8 order as to Jason Kaehlor.

9 According to Plaintiff, Defendant William Hale has called him a  
10 "fag" and told Plaintiff to kill himself. ECF No. 45. Although these  
11 allegations are concerning, this case is not the proper avenue for  
12 Plaintiff to litigate new and independent claims, even if made against  
13 a current Defendant. Nor do Plaintiff's allegation show any  
14 interference with his ability to pursue this case. Therefore, the  
15 Court finds Plaintiff's requested protective order would not be  
16 appropriate as to Defendant Hale.

17 Plaintiff alleges that non-party Anthony Gonzalez denied  
18 Plaintiff access to his legal property. ECF No. 45. Defendants  
19 concede that nearly two weeks passed between Plaintiff's request to  
20 access his legal documents on October 6, 2016, and his access on  
21 October 19. ECF No. 53 at 65. However, Plaintiff fails to establish -  
22 and there is no indication - that this caused him to miss any  
23 deadlines or otherwise caused the type of "actual injury" that is  
24 required for an access-to-the-courts claim. *See Vandelft v. Moses*, 31  
25 F.3d 794, 797 (9th Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 116 S. Ct. 91 (1995).  
26 The Court finds a protective order is not currently necessary to

1 ensure Plaintiff continues to have adequate access to the courts and  
2 his files.

3 **B. Request for Transfer**

4 Plaintiff argues that placement at Washington State Penitentiary  
5 (WSP), rather than at Stafford Creek Corrections Center, is preventing  
6 him from properly participating in this lawsuit. ECF No. 45. The  
7 Court has not directed the Washington State Department of Corrections  
8 (DOC) to place Plaintiff in any particular facility. On October 4,  
9 2016, the Court admonished the DOC to refrain from repeatedly  
10 transferring Plaintiff in a manner that would interfere with his  
11 ability to litigate his cases, including Case 5038, which has pretrial  
12 conferences and trial scheduled to take place in the near future.

13 The Court remains determined to ensure Plaintiff is afforded  
14 adequate access to the courts and a fair opportunity to present his  
15 claims. However, the Court finds that placement at WSP does not  
16 undermine these goals. Plaintiff's numerous filings since placement  
17 at WSP suggest he is fully capable of litigating his cases from there.  
18 Moreover, Stafford Creek personnel aver that the entirety of  
19 Plaintiff's legal materials have been sent to WSP. ECF No. 53 at 12.  
20 Thus, the Court finds no reasonable basis to interfere with DOC's  
21 decision to place Plaintiff at WSP, especially given the need for  
22 Plaintiff to be able to litigate Case 5038.

23 **II. PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL WSP (ECF NO. 47)**

24 Plaintiff also requests that the Court compel WSP to prohibit  
25 Shari Hall from handling his legal scans for electronic filing, create  
26 a receipt-signature requirement for electronic filings, and limit

1 people who handle legal scans to those who are specifically trained to  
2 do so. ECF No. 47. General Order Nos. 15-35-1 and 16-35-1 govern the  
3 Prisoner E-Filing Initiative created by the Eastern District of  
4 Washington and the Washington Department of Corrections, and the  
5 orders specifically state that printed notices of electronic filings  
6 are to be provided through the institution's existing mail system.  
7 This decision was the product of significant negotiation and  
8 consideration of how to limit the burden on prison staff while  
9 expanding prisoners' ability to bring claims, and Defendants have  
10 supplied sworn declarations that WSP is in full compliance with the  
11 directives implemented under the E-filing Initiative. See Case 5038,  
12 ECF No. 276.

13 Plaintiff has not demonstrated that WSP policies interfere with  
14 his ability to litigate this case. Nor has he shown Shari Hall has  
15 personally interfered with his litigation or otherwise engaged in  
16 misconduct. The Court therefore denies his motion.

17 **III. MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER (ECF NO. 60)**

18 Most recently, Plaintiff asks the Court to prohibit Defendant  
19 Hale from having any contact with Plaintiff, and to prohibit Defendant  
20 R Jason Morgan from having any contact with Plaintiff's legal  
21 property. As it addresses issues outside the case at hand, the Court  
22 denies Plaintiff's motion.

23 Plaintiff reiterates the allegations against Defendant Hale made  
24 in his earlier Motion for Protective Order and Transfer, ECF No. 45,  
25 addressed above, and adds allegations that Defendant Hale physically  
26 assaults Plaintiff by digging fingers into his arm during escorts. ECF

1 No. 60. Even if true, Plaintiff's allegations lie outside the scope  
2 of this case.

3 Plaintiff accuses Defendant R Jason Morgan of "using his notary  
4 service to read [Plaintiff]'s legal documents" after he had requested  
5 notary service from the law librarian for documents relating to this  
6 case. ECF No. 60. Again, however, Plaintiff has not demonstrated that  
7 Defendant Morgan acting as a notary in the prison context has  
8 undermined Plaintiff's ability to litigate this case, and the Court  
9 will not interfere unnecessarily with the internal operations of the  
10 prison facility. The Court therefore denies his motion.

11 **IV. MOVING FORWARD**

12 As this case progresses, the Court admonishes the DOC to ensure  
13 Plaintiff continues to have adequate access to the courts. As this  
14 Court has already advised Plaintiff in Case 5038, the Court is aware  
15 that Plaintiff faces challenges in pursuing this litigation, but notes  
16 that many such challenges are inherent when any individual -  
17 especially a prisoner - chooses to litigate multiple lawsuits  
18 simultaneously. Because of these inherent difficulties, the Court  
19 has, when appropriate, extended deadlines and granted reconsideration  
20 of issues to ensure Plaintiff is not denied access to the courts.  
21 That said, the Court's flexibility is not permission for Plaintiff to  
22 air his every grievance against Defendants, WSP, and/or the DOC. The  
23 DOC is given broad authority to implement practices and procedures -  
24 even if inconvenient - that are reasonably related to legitimate  
25 penological interests. See *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987).  
26 The Court wishes to make clear to Plaintiff that "adequate" or

1 "reasonable" access to the courts is not synonymous with "unfettered"  
2 access. Plaintiff is to refrain from filing motions that are outside  
3 the narrow scope of his claims in this case.

4 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

5 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order and Transfer, **ECF No.**  
6 **45**, is **DENIED**.

7 2. Plaintiff's Motion to Compel WSP, **ECF No. 47**, is **DENIED**.

8 3. Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order, **ECF No. 60**, is **DENIED**.

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk's Office shall enter this  
10 Order and provide copies to Plaintiff, all counsel, and the DOC.

11  
12  
13 **DATED** this 21st day of November 2016.

14 

15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 EDWARD F. SHEA  
17 Senior United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26