

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

7 PMT NPL FINANCING 2015-1,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 THOMAS C. LEE, et al.,

11 Defendants.  
12

Case No. C17-535 RSM

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM  
DEADLINE AND DIRECTING  
DEFENDANT TO FILE STATE COURT  
COMPLAINT

13 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Thomas C. Lee's "Notice and  
14 Request for Temporary Extension of Time for Compliance with FRCP 26(f) Conference." Dkt.  
15 #8. The Court interprets Mr. Lee's Motion as a request for relief from deadline. *See* LCR 7(j).  
16 The Court notes two procedural errors with this Motion. First, Mr. Lee's Motion is titled  
17 "Plaintiff's Notice and Request for Temporary Extension of Time for Compliance with FRCP  
18 26(f) Conference," but is filed by *Defendant* Thomas C. Lee. Dkt. #8 at 1. Second, Mr. Lee  
19 has failed to note the Motion for consideration by the Court as required under Local Rule 7(d).  
20

21 Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, "[a] motion for relief from a deadline should,  
22 whenever possible, be filed sufficiently in advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on  
23 the motion prior to the deadline." LCR 7(j). "Parties should not assume that the motion will be  
24 granted and must comply with the existing deadline unless the court orders otherwise." *Id.*  
25

26 The Court finds that Mr. Lee's Motion fails to set forth any specific grounds for his  
27 request for relief, and that it was improperly filed one day *after* the deadline for the Rule 26(f)  
28

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM DEADLINE AND DIRECTING DEFENDANT TO  
FILE STATE COURT COMPLAINT - 1

1 Conference had passed. Accordingly, the Court will deny this request. The parties are directed  
2 to immediately engage in the required Rule 26(f) Conference.

3 The Court also notes that Mr. Lee has failed to file a copy of the State Court Complaint  
4 as required in this matter despite a notice to Mr. Lee from the Court on May 18, 2017. *See* Dkt.  
5 #7. Instead of filing the Complaint, Mr. Lee has filed “Eviction Summons” that discuss the  
6 possibility of a Complaint being filed by Plaintiff in the future. Dkt. #1-1. The Court directs  
7 Mr. Lee to immediately file a copy of the State Court Complaint, if it exists, or otherwise  
8 respond to the Court with an explanation for his failure to file the Complaint.  
9

10 Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby  
11 finds and ORDERS that:

- 12
- 13 (1) Defendant Thomas C. Lee’s “Notice and Request for Temporary Extension of Time  
14 for Compliance with FRCP 26(f) Conference” (Dkt. #8) is DENIED.
  - 15 (2) The Parties are directed to immediately engage in the required Rule 26(f)  
16 Conference. This conference should occur no later than noon on June 5, 2017, to  
17 allow the parties time to meet the initial disclosure deadline set forth in the Court’s  
18 May 1, 2017, Order.
  - 19 (3) Defendant Lee is directed to immediately file a copy of the State Court Complaint,  
20 if it exists, or otherwise respond to the Court with an explanation for his failure to  
21 file the Complaint. **This must be filed with the Court no later than June 9, 2017.**
- 22

23 DATED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of June 2017.  
24

25  
26 

27 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
28 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28