

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

9 OSSIE LEE SLAUGHTER,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 DAN WHITE, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO. C16-1067 RSM-JPD

ORDER DENYING OBJECTIONS TO
MAGISTRATE JUDGE ORDER

14 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Ossie L. Slaughter's "Objection to the
15 Magistrate Judge's Order Granting Defendant's Motion for More Definite Statement." Dkt. #65.
16 On August 17, 2017, an Order was issued by the Honorable James P. Donohue, United States
17 Magistrate Judge, directing Plaintiff to file, no later than October 2, 2017, a more definite
18 statement detailing his claims against only the five remaining defendants remaining in this action.
19 *See* Dkt. #62. Plaintiff brings this Motion under Rule 72(a). Rule 72(a) allows a party whose case
20 is before a magistrate judge to "serve and file objections" to an order addressing nondispositive
21 matters. These objections are to be heard by the district judge in the case, who is to "modify or set
22 aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).
23
24

ORDER DENYING OBJECTIONS TO MAGISTRATE
JUDGE ORDER - 1

1 Plaintiff offers much argument about the merits of his case, but does not adequately explain
2 why the underlying Magistrate Judge’s Order is “clearly erroneous” or “contrary to law.” *See* Fed.
3 R. Civ. P. 72 (a). Plaintiff argues that requiring a more definite statement “would also cause Mr.
4 Slaughter, and his civil complaint undue prejudices, and allows the defendant’s [sic] and their
5 coworkers the opportunities [sic] to continue retaliating against Mr. Slaughter...” Dkt. #65 at 12.

6 Plaintiff need not present arguments about the merits of his case at this juncture—he must
7 set forth why the Magistrate Judge’s Order directing Plaintiff to file a more definite statement is
8 clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Plaintiff has failed to do so. The Court is not convinced that
9 being required to file a more definite statement limited to claims against the remaining Defendants
10 could cause undue prejudice to Plaintiff. To the contrary, it should aid everyone involved by
11 moving the case forward more quickly. The Court has reviewed Judge Donohue’s Order and finds
12 no basis to modify or set it aside.

13 Accordingly, having reviewed the relevant briefing, the declarations and exhibits attached
14 thereto, and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff
15 Slaughter’s “Objection to Magistrate Order,” Dkt. #65, is DENIED. Because the deadline to file a
16 more definite statement has passed, the Court amends the deadline to **November 14, 2017**. The
17 remainder of Judge Donohue’s Order, Dkt. #62, remains in effect. This matter continues to be
18 referred to Judge Donohue.

19 Dated this 24 day of October, 2017.

20
21 

22 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
23 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE