

THE HONORABLE JUDGE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MARTA D. LYALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. BANK NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION; TRUMAN TITLE 2013  
SC3 TITLE TRUST; TRUMAN  
CAPITAL ADVISORS, LP;  
RUSHMORE LOAN MANAGEMENT  
SERVICES, LLC; BANK OF AMERICA,  
N.A.; DITECH HOME LOAN  
SERVICING; CWABS MASTER  
TRUST, REVOLVING HOME EQUITY  
LOAN ASSET BACKED NOTES,  
SERIES 2004-"O"; CARNEGIE  
MELLON UNIVERSITY; UNIVERSITY  
OF WASHINGTON; WASHINGTON  
STATE DEPARTMENT OF  
COMMERCE; DISPUTE RESOLUTION  
CENTER OF KING COUNTY; and  
JOHN AND JANE DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

Case No: 17-00472-RAJ

ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO  
SEEK PERMISSION BEFORE FILING  
ANY ADDITIONAL MOTIONS

Between May 30, 2017 and June 12, 2017, Plaintiff has attempted, among other things, to amend her complaint without seeking leave from the Court, filed multiple notices regarding why she failed to respond to a motion to dismiss, contradicted those notices when the Court took her at her word based upon those

notices, appealed the Court's Order, filed additional TROs, filed amendments to pleadings within hours of filing the initial versions, filed a TRO on this Court's docket when the TRO was meant for the Court of Appeals, and sought an emergency recusal of the undersigned Judge. *See, generally*, Dkt. ## 16-44. Plaintiff's irresponsible pleading tactics have caused great inefficiencies within the undersigned's chambers, and allowing Plaintiff to continue down this path threatens to derail this litigation. For these reasons, the Court exercises its discretion to preclude Plaintiff from filing any additional motions without prior approval.

Plaintiff may not file any future motions without first seeking permission from the Court. In seeking permission, Plaintiff must explain to the Court the type of motion she plans to file, why she needs to file the motion, and whether she has met and conferred with opposing counsel regarding the motion in compliance with this Court's Standing Order (*see* Dkt. # 10) and this district's Local Rules. Plaintiff must offer the Court more than mere conclusions or vague statements when seeking permission to file future motions. Plaintiff is warned that the Court expects her to meet and confer with opposing counsel; failure to do so may result in the Court denying her permission to file additional motions.

Moreover, the Court will not accept amended pleadings filed within hours of the initial pleading. This means that Plaintiff must diligently review and edit her initial drafts. As stated above, Plaintiff must seek permission to file an amendment to any pleadings, and she is warned that the Court will deny her leave to file amendments if the proposed changes could have been incorporated in her initial pleading. If the Court grants Plaintiff permission to file an amendment, then Plaintiff is responsible for ensuring that the initial filing is terminated.

To avoid any immediate confusion, the Court clarifies its expectations with regard to the currently pending motions:

1. Plaintiff has permission to respond to Defendants' motion to dismiss in docket number 34, but must do so within the deadline set by the Local Rules, which is no later than Monday, June 26, 2017. *See* W.D. Wash. Local Rules LCR 7(d).
2. Plaintiff has permission to respond to Defendants' motion in docket number 37, but must do so within the deadline set by the Local Rules, which is no later than Monday, June 19, 2017. *See* W.D. Wash. Local Rules LCR 7(d).

Dated this 14th day of June, 2017.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Richard A. Jones", written over a horizontal line.

The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
United States District Judge