

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PHILLIP HAWLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

SNOQUALMIE CITY OF, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C14-1716 MJP

ORDER ON MOTIONS

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend Complaint (Dkt. Nos. 25, 26), Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 27), and Plaintiff’s Motion to Modify Protective Order and for Sanctions (Dkt. No. 28). Having considered the Parties’ briefing and the related record, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend and DENIES Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel and Motion to Modify Protective Order.

Plaintiff’s motion to amend his complaint to include a claim for conversion against the Snoqualmie Police Department is GRANTED. Although Plaintiff would likely be able to recover for all damages stemming from his false imprisonment if he is successful on that claim—including the resulting loss of his clothing—Defendants are not prejudiced by the amendment

1 because the Snoqualmie Police Department is in control of, and has always been in control of,  
2 the information regarding Plaintiff's clothing.

3 Plaintiff's motion to compel information about the Snoqualmie Police Department's  
4 arrest history involving unserved no-contact orders is DENIED. Defendants are unable to  
5 produce the information Plaintiff seeks because their computer system does not provide a  
6 mechanism to search for the data requested. (Dkt. No. 30.) Hand reviewing the Department's  
7 available documents or informally polling the Department's current officers would not yield  
8 accurate, reliable information responsive to Plaintiff's inquiries.

9 Plaintiff's motion to modify protective order is DENIED. The Court has already  
10 determined that Officer Stonebraker's past marital history is not relevant to this action. Plaintiff  
11 has acquired the information he sought about Officer Stonebraker's current marriage, and  
12 Defendants have not objected. No further personal information is relevant, and there is no need  
13 to modify the protective order at this time. Plaintiff's request for sanctions is DENIED.

#### 14 **Conclusion**

15 The Court GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (Dkt. Nos. 25, 26) and ORDERS  
16 Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within ten (10) days of the date of this order. Plaintiff's  
17 Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 27) and Motion to Modify Protective Order (Dkt. No. 28) are  
18 DENIED.

19 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

20  
21 Dated this 11th day of August, 2015.

22 

23 Marsha J. Pechman  
24 Chief United States District Judge