

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

KIRK A. BRENON,

Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY LEDGERWOOD, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C14-1073-RSM-MAT

ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
FOR COURT ORDER

Plaintiff Kirk Brenon proceeds *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He raises challenges in this lawsuit associated with his medical treatment at the King County Jail, and names nurses Nancy Ledgerwood, Glenn Lirman, David Doe, and Elain Henriksen as defendants.

Plaintiff filed a Motion Requesting Court Order. (Dkt. 16.) He seeks an Order directing the King County Prosecutor’s Office or the King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD) to provide him with (1) the use of a laptop to view digitally stored documents he has requested from Public Health of Seattle and King County, (2) downloaded copies of court rules, and (3) paper, envelopes, and legal tablets. Defendants oppose plaintiff’s request, asserting the Court lacks jurisdiction over non-parties King County Prosecutor’s Office and

ORDER  
PAGE - 1

1 DAJD, and stating that plaintiff has access to the materials needed to pursue his claims in this  
2 matter. (Dkt. 18.)

3 Having now considered the motion and defendants' response, the Court finds and  
4 concludes as follows:

5 (1) Defendants attest that plaintiff was provided with a pro se supplies and  
6 information packet upon his designation as a pro se inmate by DAJD, has access to a computer  
7 on which he can conduct legal research, including research into court rules, and may purchase  
8 additional supplies from the commissary. (*See* Dkts. 18 & 20.) Also, while he may secure use  
9 of a laptop where he receives a discovery request in electronic form not capable of being printed  
10 out in paper form (*see id.*), plaintiff's document request is not related to discovery (Dkt. 19) and  
11 he concedes his ability to obtain the documents at issue in paper form, albeit at greater expense  
12 (Dkt. 16 at 2).

13 The Court finds no basis for granting plaintiff's request. Plaintiff's IFP status does not  
14 exempt him from paying for litigation expenses. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), (d) (permitting only the  
15 waiver of prepayment of filing and service of process costs for IFP litigants); *Tedder v. Odel*,  
16 890 F.2d 210, 211-12 (9th Cir. 1989) (“[T]he expenditure of public funds [on behalf of an  
17 indigent litigant] is proper only when authorized by Congress. . . .”; “Although the plain  
18 language of section 1915 provides for service of process for an indigent's witnesses, it does not  
19 waive payment of fees or expenses for those witnesses.”) (quoting *United States v. MacCollom*,  
20 426 U.S. 317, 321 (1976)). Nor do defendants have an obligation to furnish plaintiff with the  
21 requested materials. *Cf. Rivera v. DiSabato*, 962 F. Supp. 38, 40 (D.N.J. 1997) (denying request  
22 for free deposition transcript; “[P]laintiff's obligation, even as an indigent litigant, to finance his  
23 own litigation expenses cannot be arbitrarily thrust upon defendants.”). Plaintiff's Motion

1 Requesting Court Order (Dkt. 16) is, for these reasons, DENIED.

2 (2) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to plaintiff, counsel for  
3 defendants, and to Judge Martinez.

4 DATED this 17th day of November, 2014.

5 

6 Mary Alice Theiler  
7 Chief United States Magistrate Judge

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23