

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

LIFEGOALS CORP.,
Plaintiff,

v.

ADVANCED HAIR
RESTORATION LLC,
Defendant.

CASE NO. C16-1733JLR

ORDER ON MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO SUBMIT LATE
FILINGS

ADVANCED HAIR
RESTORATION LLC,
Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.

JERRY DAVIS,
Third-Party Defendant.

Before the court is Plaintiff LifeGoals Corp.’s (“LifeGoals”) motion for leave to submit two late filings: a response to Defendant and Third-Party Plaintiff Advanced Hair

1 Restoration LLC's ("AHR") motion for summary judgment (MSJ (Dkt. # 31)), and a
2 response to AHR's motion to compel (MTC (Dkt. # 34)). (Mot. (Dkt. # 39).)


3 AHR filed a motion for summary judgment on October 26, 2017, and a motion to
4 compel on November 2, 2017 (*see* MSJ; MTC); both motions noted on November 17,
5 2017 (*see id.*). Pursuant to the local rules, LifeGoals should have responded to both
6 motions no later than Monday, November 13, 2017. *See* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR
7 7(d)(3) ("Any opposition papers shall be filed and served not later than the Monday
8 before the noting day."). However, because counsel for LifeGoals was unfamiliar with
9 the concept of a "noting date," counsel believed that "the 'noting date' was the due date
10 for Responses to Motions." (Mot. at 2.) Thus, LifeGoals submitted responses to both
11 motions on November 17, 2017—four days after the deadline. (*See* Resp. to MSJ (Dkt.
12 # 36); Resp. to MTC (Dkt. # 38).) AHR subsequently asked that the court not consider
13 the untimely responses, or in the alternative, to grant an extension of time for AHR to file
14 its replies. (Request (Dkt. # 37) at 1-2.)

15 The court reprimands LifeGoals and its counsel for its late submissions. Such
16 conduct falls well below the standard of practice expected of attorneys appearing before
17 this court. The court expects counsel for LifeGoals, including its local counsel on the
18 matter, to read and adhere to the local rules for this district. The court will consider
19 substantial sanctions in the future if counsel for LifeGoals continues to fail to meet this
20 minimum standard of practice, and LifeGoals is cautioned that the court will not accept
21 any further tardy filings based on a misapprehension of the court's local rules.

22 //

1 However, because there is no prejudice in this instance to AHR, the court
2 GRANTS leave for Lifegoals to submit its two late responses (Dkt. # 39). The court will
3 accept the two late responses as filed on the docket. (See Resp. to MSJ; Resp. to MTC.)
4 The court further DIRECTS AHR to file its replies, if any, to both responses no later than
5 noon on Wednesday, November 29, 2017. Lastly, the court DIRECTS the Clerk to
6 renote both AHR's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. # 31) and motion to compel
7 (Dkt. # 34) to November 29, 2017.

8 Dated this 20th day of November, 2017.

9 
10 JAMES L. ROBART
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22