

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

10 JESSICA SAEPOFF,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 JAY RIEHLE, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C17-0482JLR

ORDER EXTENDING
DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

15 Before the court is *pro se* Plaintiff Jessica Saepoff’s motion for an extension of
16 time to respond to the court’s order to show cause. (MFE (Dkt. # 33).) On April 21,
17 2017, the court denied Ms. Saepoff’s motions for preliminary injunctive relief and
18 ordered her to show cause by May 5, 2017, why the court should not dismiss her claims
19 against the Internal Revenue Service-affiliated defendants for lack of subject matter
20 jurisdiction. (4/21/17 Order (Dkt. # 22) at 8-9.) In light of her *pro se* status and the
21 “huge amount of research into complex issues” that Ms. Saepoff states she must perform,
22 she seeks a 30-day extension of the deadline to respond to the court’s order. (MFE at 2.)

1 In its order to show cause, the court thoroughly discussed the statute and case law
2 that appears to oust the court of subject matter jurisdiction over her claims against the
3 governmental defendants. (4/21/17 Order at 6-7.) The two weeks that the court afforded
4 Ms. Saepoff to respond to its order already contemplated her *pro se* status and the
5 complexity of the legal issues involved. Furthermore, Ms. Saepoff has filed a 28-page
6 complaint and two motions for preliminary injunctive relief of more than 20 pages. (*See*
7 *Compl.* (Dkt. # 1); *TRO Mot.* (Dkt. # 6); *Am. TRO Mot.* (Dkt. # 20).) She asserts both
8 constitutional and statutory claims. (*See generally Compl.*) She sues 10 named
9 defendants, which consist of governmental and private entities, and a series of Doe
10 defendants. (*See id.* at 1.) In other words, any legal or logistical complexity in this case
11 is of Ms. Saepoff's own making.

12 Nevertheless, in light of Ms. Saepoff's *pro se* status and Defendants'
13 non-opposition (*see MFE* at 2), the court GRANTS in part her motion for an extension of
14 time (Dkt. # 33) and extends her deadline to respond to the order to show cause by one
15 week, to May 12, 2017. Defendants may, but are not required to, respond to the order to
16 show cause by that date. (*See 4/21/17 Order* at 9.) This extension does not impact Ms.
17 Saepoff's deadlines to respond to the pending motions to dismiss (Dkt. ## 13, 28, 29),

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

1 and the court will not look favorably upon any request to extend those deadlines.

2 Dated this 3rd day of May, 2017.

3
4 

5 JAMES L. ROBART
6 United States District Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22