

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

LYNN DALE HOVER and MILA JEAN HOVER,)
Plaintiffs,) CASE NO. C17-0902RSM
v.)
GMAC MORTGAGE CORPORATION) ORDER STRIKING UNTIMELY
aka DITECH FINANCIAL LLC dba) RESPONSES
ditech.com, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)

On September 18, 2017, Plaintiffs filed three responses to Defendants' pending Motions to Dismiss. Dkts. #33, #34, and #35. Plaintiffs previously moved for an extension of time to respond to one of those pending motions to dismiss – that filed by Defendant Northwest Trustee Services, Inc. Dkt. #23. The Court granted that motion and allowed Plaintiffs to file an untimely response. Dkt. #29. However, in that same Order the Court explicitly noted:

Plaintiffs **have not** moved for an extension of time to respond to the pending motions to dismiss filed by Defendants Fannie Mae, MERS, Nationstar Mortgager LLC, Bank of America, N.A., and Ditech Financial. Dkts. #17, #19 and #22. Those motions are ripe for review and **no extension of time to respond to those motions has been granted.**

Dkt. #29 at 2 (emphasis in original). In complete violation of the Court’s Order, Plaintiffs have now filed their untimely responses and ask the Court to accept them simply because they are *pro se* Plaintiffs. Dkt. #32.

**ORDER
PAGE - 1**

1 The Court has previously informed Plaintiffs that they are expected to be familiar with
2 the Court's Local Rules, particularly those related to the filing of motions and responses. Dkt.
3 #29 at 2. Plaintiffs have demonstrated that they know how to ask the Court for permission to file
4 untimely responses, as they have done so in this case. *See* Dkt. #23. For whatever reason, they
5 declined to follow proper Court procedures with respect to two of the pending Motions to
6 Dismiss.
7

8 Accordingly, the Court hereby STRIKES Plaintiffs' responses (Dkts. #34 and #35) to the
9 pending motions to dismiss filed by Defendants Fannie Mae, MERS, Nationstar Mortgager LLC,
10 Bank of America, N.A., and Ditech Financial, and the Court will not consider those responses in
11 reviewing Defendants' motions.
12

13 DATED this 19 day of September, 2017.

14
15 
16

17 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
18 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28