

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

7 JOE J.W. ROBERTS, JR.,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 VILMA KHOUNPHIXAY, et al.,

11 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:18-cv-00746-MJP-BAT

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR EXTENSION TO
FILE RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT ON PLEADINGS**

12 Before the Court is Plaintiff Joe J.W. Roberts, Jr.'s motion for a 20-day extension of his
13 deadline to respond to Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings. Dkt. 38 (noted for
14 October 19, 2018). Dkt. 33. Mr. Roberts states that he the needs the extension because he lacks
15 adequate access to a law library and paper, and he needs additional discovery. *Id.*

16 Mr. Roberts' grounds for an extension are without merit. His filings are replete with
17 citations to case law indicating that he does have access to an adequate law library. Although he
18 complains of a lack of paper, Mr. Roberts has not been hindered in filing numerous motions and
19 other filings. *See, e.g.*, Dkts. 22, 24, 32, 38, 40, and 41. Additionally, because Defendants'
20 motion for judgment on the pleadings is governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c), which tests the
21 sufficiency of the allegations in the complaint, additional discovery is not necessary at this time.
22 Finally, the Court has stayed all discovery in this matter pending resolution of Defendants'
23 motion for judgment on the pleadings. Dkt. 46.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR EXTENSION TO FILE RESPONSE TO
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON PLEADINGS

