1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
7	AT SEATTLE	
8	HENDRICKS & LEWIS, PLLC,	
9	Plaintiff,	Case No. C12-0841RSL
10 11	V.	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
11	GEORGE CLINTON,	MOTION TO STRIKE, DISMISS, AND/OR TRANSFER
12	Defendant.	
13		
15	This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion to Strike H&L's	
16	Consolidated Pleading for Judgment Enforcement Relief, to Dismiss for Improper Venue	
17	or, in the Alternative, to Transfer Venue to the Central District of California." Dkt. # 43.	
18	Having reviewed the memoranda, declaration, and exhibits submitted by the parties, <sup>1</sup> the	
19	Court finds as follows:	
20	(1) Motion to Strike Consolidated Pleading	
21	On August 30, 2012, the Court severed the counterclaims in C11-1142RSL,	
22	consolidated them with two other actions, and directed Hendricks & Lewis to file and serve	
23		
24	<sup>1</sup> Despite requesting oral argument, defendant declined to file a reply memorandum in support of the relief requested. This matter can be decided on the papers submitted. Defendant's request for oral argument is DENIED.	
25 26	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE, DISMISS, AND/OR TRANSFER - 1	

a consolidated pleading in this matter. <u>Clinton v. Hendricks & Lewis</u>, C11-1142RSL, Dkt.
 # 39. A consolidated pleading would, of necessity, amend the initial filing. The purpose of
 this amendment was to ensure that there was a single operative pleading governing the
 consolidated action. The fact that defendant must respond to the amended pleading is a
 function of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, not a nefarious plot on Hendricks &
 Lewis' part.

7

## (2) Motion to Dismiss for Improper Venue

8 Plaintiff's claim for assignment and judicial sale of four copyrights owned by 9 Clinton to pay judgments previously entered in this district was originally filed as a 10 counterclaim in a legal malpractice action initiated by Clinton in this district. Clinton v. 11 Hendricks & Lewis, C11-1142RSL, Dkt. # 32. In that case, Clinton twice objected to venue in this district on the ground that Hendricks & Lewis should not be permitted to seek 12 13 the same relief in two different courts (C11-1142RSL, Dkt. # 34 and Dkt. # 61), but he 14 failed to show that venue in a district he chose (and where the underlying judgments were entered) was improper (C11-1142RSL, Dkt. # 38). Under the law of the case doctrine, the 15 16 Court will not revisit the issue of venue. In addition, any objection based on 28 U.S.C. § 1400 was waived when Clinton failed to raise the issue in his previous motions to dismiss 17 18 in C11-1142RSL and in this consolidated action, despite the fact that all relevant 19 substantive facts and applicable law were known to the parties. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(g)(2)and 12(h)(1).<sup>2</sup> 20

- 21
- 22
- 23

24

25

26 ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE, DISMISS, AND/OR TRANSFER - 2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Even if the Court were to consider Clinton's venue argument on the merits, he has failed to show that an action to execute on a judgment arises "under any Act of Congress relating to copyrights." 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a).

1

7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## (3) Motion to Transfer Venue

In the alternative, Clinton requests that the Court transfer this consolidated action to the Central District of California. This requests must be denied under the law of the case doctrine and on its merits: Clinton has not shown that venue in this district is improper or that the convenience of the parties or the interests of justice support, much less require, a transfer.

## (4) Sanctions

8 Clinton's repeated motions to dismiss and/or transfer lack merit and appear to 9 be nothing more than a frivolous attempt to delay execution on the judgments entered by 10 the Honorable John C. Coughenour in 2010. At least one of the motions to dismiss was 11 necessitated by plaintiff's initiation of multiple actions, however. The Court finds that 12 sanctions are not appropriate at this time. The filing of additional motions raising issues 13 that have already been decided or arguments that have clearly been waived may, however, 14 result in the imposition of sanctions in the future, including an award of costs and fees.

For all of the foregoing reasons, defendant's motion to strike, dismiss, and/or
transfer (Dkt. # 43) is DENIED.

Dated this 27th day of November, 2012.

MAS Casnik

Robert S. Lasnik United States District Judge

## 26 ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE, DISMISS, AND/OR TRANSFER - 3