

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JAMES D. GRIEPSMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHARLIE WEND, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C16-1843-JLR-MAT

ORDER RE: PENDING MOTIONS

Plaintiff, who proceeds *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 case, submitted two motions for extensions of time and a letter to the Court. (Dkt. 72-74.) Having considered the motions and letter, the Court finds and concludes as follows:

(1) Plaintiff’s motions seek extensions of time to respond to defendants’ declarations and to obtain defendant Brianna Roger’s address. (Dkts. 72-73.) While dated March 19 and 20, 2017, the Court did not receive the motions until June 23, 2017. By letter to the Court, plaintiff states he wrote the motions while incarcerated at Monroe Correctional Complex (MCC), gave them to his investigator to file, but only recently discovered the motions had not been filed. (Dkt. 74.) Although not entirely clear, plaintiff further appears to indicate he did not receive two of the

1 five motions filed by defendants and currently pending in this case. (*See* Dkts. 72-74 (reflecting  
2 his receipt of defendants’ motion to dismiss eleven defendants, their fourth “declaration”, and the  
3 motion to find his complaint frivolous, while indicating he had not yet received the second or third  
4 “declarations”).) He requests copies of the motions not received and additional time to submit all  
5 of his responses. Plaintiff also notes he has difficulty writing due to his hand injury and is currently  
6 homeless.<sup>1</sup>

7 Plaintiff did not timely respond to any of defendants’ pending motions. The first of those  
8 motions, seeking dismissal of plaintiff’s claims against eleven defendants (Dkt. 15), was originally  
9 noted for consideration on April 7, 2017,<sup>2</sup> and plaintiff’s current filing makes clear he received  
10 that motion while incarcerated at MCC in March of 2017 (*see* Dkts. 72-74). The other pending  
11 motions were all served by mail to plaintiff’s current, general delivery mailing address and were  
12 noted for consideration, respectively, on May 12, 2017, and June 9, 16, and 23, 2017. (*See* Dkts.  
13 38, 50, 67, and 70.) However, considering plaintiff’s *pro se* status and the circumstances described  
14 in his letter and motions to the Court, the Court finds good cause for an extension of time.

15 Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time to respond (Dkt. 72) is herein GRANTED in  
16 relation to defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Eleven Defendants (Dkt. 15), Motion to Dismiss Three  
17 Defendants (Dkt. 38), Motion to Dismiss Five Defendants (Dkt. 50), Motion to Dismiss Defendant  
18 ARNP Sue Baerg (Dkt. 67), and Motion to Find Griepsma’s Complaint Frivolous (Dkt. 70).  
19 Plaintiff must submit his response(s) to the Court on or before **August 4, 2017**. Defendants are  
20

---

21 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff additionally states he is seeking an attorney. It should be noted that, by Order dated May  
22 17, 2017, the Court denied plaintiff’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel. (*See* Dkts. 48 & 66.)

23 <sup>2</sup> The Court renoted the motion for consideration on June 16, 2016 because it was not clear whether  
it had been received by plaintiff. (Dkt. 65 (motion served by mail to Skagit County jail on March 9, 2017,  
but plaintiff had been transferred to the Washington Department of Corrections on December 23, 2016 and  
held at MCC until his release on or around March 22, 2017).)

1 directed to submit a reply to the response(s) on or before **August 18, 2017**, and the Clerk is directed  
2 to RENOTE all of defendants' motions (Dkts. 15, 38, 50, 67, 70) for consideration on **August 18,**  
3 **2017.**

4 (2) Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to obtain Brianna Roger's address (Dkt.  
5 73) is DENIED. In requesting the extension, plaintiff explains he needs more time to obtain  
6 Rogers' address "so she can be served." (Dkt. 73.) Rogers has been served and is represented by  
7 counsel in this matter. (*See* Dkts. 5-6.) There is, as such, no basis for plaintiff's request.

8 (3) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to the parties and to the Honorable  
9 James L. Robart. The Clerk is further directed to send to plaintiff copies of the Motion to Dismiss  
10 Three Defendants (Dkt. 38), Motion to Dismiss Five Defendants (Dkt. 50), and Motion to Dismiss  
11 Defendant ARNP Sue Baerg (Dkt. 67), along with all accompanying declarations (Dkts. 39-44,  
12 51-62).

13 DATED this 27th day of June, 2017.

14  
15   
16 

---

Mary Alice Theiler  
United States Magistrate Judge