1

2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 9 10 LARRY SEIP, CASE NO. C12-388-RSM 11 Plaintiff, **DISMISSAL ORDER** 12 v. 13 KING COUNTY et al., Defendants. 14 15 On September 4, 2012, the Court granted Plaintiff leave to amend his complaint to show 16 that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action. Plaintiff timely filed a motion on 17 October 10, 2012, construed by the Court as a motion to continue the deadline to amend. Dkt. # 18 16. On October 16, 2012, the Court entered a minute order granting the continuance, and 19 directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within fourteen days of the Order. Dkt. # 17. 20 Plaintiff has not yet filed an amended complaint. In both the September 4 and October 16 21 Orders, the Court stated that failure to adhere to the time restraints imposed by the Court would 22

result in dismissal of Plaintiff's case. Accordingly, Plaintiff's case is hereby dismissed with

23

24

1	prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to comply with the Court's orders.
2	The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.
3	DATED this 4 <sup>th</sup> day of January 2013.
4	
5	
6	RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	