

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

SHARON ELAINE BURLESON,

Plaintiff,

v.

SECURITY PROPERTIES
RESIDENTIAL, LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C18-0513RSL

ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO
EXTEND JOINDER
DEADLINE

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff’s “Motion and Proposed Order for Relief from the Deadline Date of October 16, 2019 to Join Additional Defendants to this Civil Lawsuit.” Dkt. # 104. The joinder deadline was established by the Court on September 18, 2019, after reviewing the joint status report submitted by the parties. In that report, plaintiff indicated that she intended to join four additional defendants. The Court gave her almost a month in which to file a motion seeking leave to join additional parties.

Plaintiff waited until the day her motion was due to request an extension of the deadline from October 16th to October 21st. She noted the motion for November 1st, effectively granting herself the requested extension. She did not, however, file her

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
TO EXTEND JOINDER DEADLINE

1 motion to join additional parties by her self-imposed deadline.¹ She has now filed a
2 second motion seeking to “revoke” her earlier request and “await the Court’s instruction
3 for a date to join additional defendants.” Dkt. # 106 at 9. Plaintiff asserts that she is
4 having trouble with her internet access and word processing program and that, as “a lone
5 complainant in this civil lawsuit,” she is having difficulty keeping up. Dkt. # 106 at 7-9.


6 The Court previously acknowledged “the challenges of pursuing federal litigation
7 without any legal training or familiarity with the procedures that govern this
8 proceeding,” but reminded plaintiff “that she chose to initiate this lawsuit and has
9 accused defendants of various wrongs, causing them to incur fees and subjecting them to
10 great uncertainty and potential distress. If she has a viable claim, she must move forward
11 in proving it expeditiously.” Dkt. # 63 at 1-2. That warning was given over a year ago,
12 and yet this case remains stalled at the pleading stage. The deadline by which parties
13 must be joined is set early in the case so that discovery progresses with all interested
14 persons and entities participating: plaintiff’s delay in seeking leave to add additional
15 defendants is not justified by any extraordinary circumstances. More importantly, the
16 delay will adversely impact all subsequent case management deadlines. Even if plaintiff
17 were to file her motion for leave to join additional defendants today, the motion would
18 not be ripe for consideration for three weeks and, given the holidays, would not likely be
19 ruled upon until early December. If granted, plaintiff would then have to personally
20 serve the complaint on the new parties, who would have the opportunity to file motions
21 to dismiss, further delaying any real progress in this matter.

22
23 ¹ It is not entirely clear what plaintiff anticipated filing on October 21st. She is
24 reminded, however, that any change in the complaint at this stage must be preceded by a
25 motion for leave to amend which complies with LCR 15. The motion for leave to add parties or
otherwise amend the complaint must set forth the reasons amendment is necessary and have as
an attachment the proposed complaint for the Court’s review.

1 This case is eighteen months old and, following two amended complaints and two
2 rounds of motions to dismiss, involves a single cause of action under the Fair Housing
3 Act against the four named defendants. Dkt. # 85 at 3. Plaintiff knew at least eight
4 weeks before the joinder deadline that she wanted to add additional parties (Dkt. # 101
5 at 2), yet no motion was filed by the deadline set by the Court or by the extended date
6 proposed by plaintiff. Plaintiff has not shown good cause or excusable neglect for an
7 extension of the joinder deadline.

8
9 For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motions for an extension of time (Dkt.
10 # 104 and Dkt. # 106) are DENIED.

11
12 Dated this 4th day of November, 2019.

13 
14 Robert S. Lasnik
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
TO EXTEND JOINDER DEADLINE