

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

8 SCOTT CARROLL BOLTON,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 KING COUNTY CORRECTIONS, et al.,

12 Defendants.

Case No. C17-388-RSM

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

13  
14 Having reviewed the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of the Honorable James P.  
15 Donohue, Chief United States Magistrate Judge, the objections or responses to that, and the  
16 remaining record, the Court finds and ORDERS:

17 (1) The Court ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation.

18 (2) After Judge Donohue issued his R&R, Plaintiff filed Objections in which he asked  
19 the Court to dismiss his Complaint without prejudice because he could not access the law library  
20 (Dkt. #15), and a separate motion to dismiss his Complaint without prejudice for the same reason  
21 (Dkt. #16). That request is DENIED. The Court expended considerable time and effort reviewing  
22 Plaintiff’s claims, assessing their merits, and determining whether Plaintiff’s action should be  
23 served on Defendants. Ultimately, Judge Donohue determined that all of Plaintiff’s claims were  
deficient and should be dismissed, and that this dismissal should count as a strike under Section

1 1915(g). Allowing Plaintiff to voluntarily dismiss this action now, after a decision has been  
2 rendered, would frustrate Congress's aim of deterring prisoners from filing baseless lawsuits. *See*  
3 *Crawford-El v. Britton*, 523 U.S. 574, 596, 118 S. Ct. 1584, 140 L. Ed. 2d 759 (1998). While the  
4 Ninth Circuit has not yet considered whether a prisoner should be allowed to voluntarily dismiss  
5 his action after screening has found it to be deficient, several District Courts have disapproved of  
6 this practice. *See Blaisdell v. Haw. Dep't of Pub. Safety*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 170446 (D. Haw.  
7 Nov. 30, 2012) (collecting such cases). Further, to the extent Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
8 41(a) generally allows voluntary dismissal, that right is not unlimited and the PLRA's screening  
9 requirement and three-strikes provisions trump the civil rule. *Id.* Accordingly, the Court adopts  
10 the R&R in full and denies Plaintiff's request to voluntarily dismiss his action without prejudice.<sup>1</sup>

11 (3) Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and this action are DISMISSED with prejudice for  
12 failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

13 (4) This dismissal counts as a STRIKE for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

14 (5) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff and to Judge Donohue.

15 Dated this 7 day of August, 2017.

16  
17  
18 

19 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
20 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
21  
22

23 <sup>1</sup> The Court also notes that Plaintiff is no stranger to this Court, having filed at least ten separate actions in this District over at least the past six years, and is therefore familiar with the Court's requirements, procedures and practices.