

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

9 BILL LIETZKE,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 CITY OF MONTGOMERY, et al.,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO. C17-1317-JLR

ORDER ON REVIEW OF
MOTION TO RECUSE

14 On October 4, 2017, Plaintiff Bill Lietzke filed an apparent proposed order in this matter.
15 *See* Dkt. #6. The Court interpreted Mr. Lietzke's filing as seeking in part the recusal of Judge
16 James L. Robart. Dkt #8. Judge Robart has declined to recuse himself and, in accordance with
17 this Court's Local Rules, referred that decision to the Chief Judge for review. *Id.*; LCR 3(e).

18 A judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his
19 impartiality "might reasonably be questioned." Federal judges also shall disqualify themselves in
20 circumstances where they have a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party or personal
21 knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding. 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(1). Mr.
22 Lietzke's proposed order provides no allegations, let alone evidence, of bias or prejudice against
23 him on the part of the Court. *See* Dkt. #6. Nor does Mr. Lietzke cite to any proper basis in statute
24 or case law for recusal. In the absence of any allegations that Judge Robart "has a personal bias

1 or prejudice either against [Mr. Lietzke] or in favor of any adverse party” (28 U.S.C. § 144), served
2 as a lawyer in this controversy while in private practice (*id.*, § 145), or has a financial interest in
3 the litigation (*id.*), there is no basis for recusal and Judge Robart was justified in declining to do
4 so.

5 Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Judge Robart’s refusal to recuse
6 himself from this matter is AFFIRMED and Mr. Lietzke’s motion (Dkt. #6) is DENIED. The
7 Clerk shall provide a copy of this Order to Mr. Lietzke.

8 DATED this 23 day of October, 2017.

9
10 

11 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
12 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24