1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
9	AT SEATTLE		
10	MICHEL LABADIE,	CASE NO. C09-1276 MJP	
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO	
12	v.	DISMISS FTCA CLAIMS	
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et. al.,		
14	Defendant.		
15			
16	This comes before the Court on Defendants' motion to dismiss claims against the		
17	individual officers. (Dkt. No. 78.) Having reviewed the motion and the Plaintiff's untimely		
18	response, the Court GRANTS Defendants' motion to dismiss.		
19	Background		
20	Plaintiff Michel Labadie ("Labadie") is a Canadian citizen currently residing in British		
21	Colombia. (Compl. ¶ 7.) Defendants Edward Escobar, Isidoro Longoria, Eoin Martinez, David		
22	Decker, Jesse Cobb, Becky Elston, Jason Honti, Jeff Sterrit, and Eric Lehmann, (together		
23	"Individual Defendants") are either Custom and Border Patrol Officers or Immigration and		
24	4 Customs Enforcement Special Agents. (<u>Id.</u> ¶ 9-10). The United States is also named as a		

defendant. (Id. ¶ 8.) Labadie alleges that on September 9, 2006, Officer Escobar held his neck 2 and punched him in the face. (Id. ¶ 15.) Labadie alleges causes of action for illegal search and 3 seizure, invasion of privacy, assault, defamation, and false light. (Id. ¶¶ 21-41.) 4 Discussion 5 Defendants seek to dismiss Plaintiff's Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA") claims against the individual officers in their official capacity. In response, Plaintiff states Defendants' motion 7 is moot because his amended complaint does not allege a FTCA claim against the individual officers. Specifically, Plaintiff states his complaint is against the individual officers in their 8 individual capacities under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Since Labadie concedes individual officers are immune from a FTCA claim in their official capacity 10 11 and Defendants are not seeking to dismiss Labadie's Bivens claims, the Court GRANTS 12 Plaintiff's motion to dismiss official capacity claims against the individual officers under the FTCA. 13 14 The Court observes Plaintiff's response to Defendants' motion to dismiss was due June 6, 15 2011 under Local Rule 7(d). Plaintiff filed his motion three days late on June 9, 2011. Since Plaintiff concedes dismissal of FTCA claims against the individual officers, the effect of this 16 17 delay is minimal. However, Plaintiff is advised that the Court will disregard future motions, 18 responses, or replies, not filed in a timely manner according to the Court's Local Rules. 19 // 20 // 21 \parallel 22 // 23 $\backslash \backslash$ 24

Conclusion The Court GRANTS Defendants' motion to dismiss FTCA claims against the individual officers in their individual capacity. The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel. Dated this 14th day of June, 2011. Marshy Melina Marsha J. Pechman United States District Judge