

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 MICHAEL DODGE,

10 Petitioner,

11 v.

12 MONROE CORRECTIONAL COMPLEX -  
TWIN RIVERS UNIT, et al.,

13 Respondents.  
14

No. C15-0183RSL

ORDER

15 On August 23, 2017, the Court received a letter from petitioner seeking to reopen the  
16 above-captioned matter and objecting to the withdrawal of funds from his prisoner account to  
17 pay the filing fee. Dkt. # 19. Petitioner asserts that he was prevented from pursuing this litigation  
18 in 2015 because his custodians at Monroe Correctional Complex interfered with his access to the  
19 law library and legal mail, his request for appointment of counsel was denied, and he is legally  
20 blind. Petitioner also argues that the Court improperly charged a filing fee after granting his  
21 application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.


22 Petitioner's challenges at the correctional facility were known in 2015 and did not prevent  
23 him from participating in this litigation: he timely amended his application to proceed *in forma*  
24 *pauperis* (Dkt. # 5), requested an extension of time and appointment of counsel (Dkt. # 9), and  
25 objected to the Report and Recommendation (Dkt. # 12). His request for counsel was denied  
26 because the exceptional circumstances justifying the appointment of counsel in a civil case did

ORDER

1 not exist. Dkt. # 10 at 2. Nor was there any indication that his vision impairment made him  
2 unable to articulate his claims *pro se*. Finally, his objection to the payment of the filing fee was  
3 overruled at Dkt. # 18. The application to proceed *in forma pauperis* included a specific  
4 “Acknowledgment and Authorization” just above the signature line in which petitioner  
5 authorized the agency having custody over him to collect monthly payments toward the filing  
6 fee.

7  
8 Judgment was entered in this case on July 7, 2015. Petitioner has not established any of  
9 the grounds that could justify relief from that judgment as set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). His  
10 request to reopen the case is therefore DENIED.

11  
12 Dated this 29th day of August, 2017.

13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 Robert S. Lasnik  
16 United States District Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26