Slaughter v. White et al

Doc. 78

Plaintiff objected to the Order directing him to file a more definite statement and, when his objections were denied by the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez, Chief United States District

Judge, on October 24, 2017, plaintiff was given a new deadline of November 14, 2017 to file his more definite statement. (*See* Dkts. 65, 68.)

Plaintiff thereafter filed a motion for an extension of time to file his more definite statement and to file objections to the undersigned's Report and Recommendation recommending that plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief be denied. (Dkt. 70.) On November 17, 2017, the undersigned issued an Order granting plaintiff additional time to file his more definite statement, and set a new deadline of January 16, 2018. (Dkt. 73.) On November 28, 2017, Chief Judge Martinez issued an Order granting plaintiff additional time to file objections to the pending Report and Recommendation, and set a new deadline of January 22, 2018. (Dkt. 74.) Plaintiff did not timely file a more definite statement or objections to the Report and Recommendation. Instead, plaintiff filed the instant motion in which he claims that the prior Orders granting him additional time require clarification, and that this need for clarification, in addition to his need to obtain some of his legal property which has yet to catch up with him after two recent transfers between Washington Department of Corrections facilities, justify additional extensions.

On February 2, 2018, Chief Judge Martinez denied plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to file his objections to the pending Report and Recommendation, concluding that plaintiff had not set forth sufficient good cause for a second extension of time. (*See* Dkt. 77.) This Court is skeptical as well about whether another extension is justified. Certainly, plaintiff's suggestion that the Court's prior Orders created some sort of confusion which impeded his ability to timely

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT - 2

1

comply with either deadline strains credulity. This Court also questions whether plaintiff actually requires any additional legal materials to perform what should be the relatively simple task of providing details regarding his claims against defendants Brittany West, Lance Rogers, S. Ewing, Sheryl Allbert, and C/O Jones. However, in order to ensure that plaintiff has every reasonable opportunity to comply with the directive that he provide a more definite statement, the Court will grant one *final* extension and will also provide plaintiff with copies of documents on file with the Court which should assist him in this endeavor.

Based on the foregoing, the Court hereby ORDERS as follows:

- (1) Plaintiff's second motion for an extension of time to file a more definite statement (Dkt. 76) is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall file his more definite statement not later than *March* 28, 2018. No further extensions will be granted. If plaintiff fails to comply with this deadline, the Court will recommend dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute.
- (2) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to plaintiff together with copies of plaintiff's second amended complaint (Dkt. 39), the Report and Recommendation screening plaintiff's second amended complaint (Dkt. 44), defendants' motion for a more definite statement (Dkt. 59), and this Court's Order granting defendants' motion for a more definite statement (Dkt. 62). The Clerk is further directed to send a copy of this Order to counsel for defendants and to Chief Judge Martinez.

ames P. Donobue

Chief United States Magistrate Judge

MES P. DONOHUE

DATED this 28th day of February, 2018.

22

23

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE **MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT - 3**