

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ANNE BLOCK,

Plaintiff,

v.

WASHINGTON STATE BAR  
ASSOCIATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C18-907RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte* based on a Bar Order issued on April 13, 2016, against Plaintiff Anne Block in this Court. *See* Dkt. #122 in *Block v. Washington State Bar Association et al.*, Case No. 2:15-cv-02018-RSM (W.D. Wash. 2016). That Order stated:

Any pro se complaint submitted for filing in this District in which Anne Block is a named Plaintiff or purports to act as party representative shall be subject to review by the Court prior to the issuance of summons or service of process. . . . The Court will review the proposed Complaint to determine whether good cause exists to permit the action to proceed in light of the claims raised therein and Ms. Block’s past litigation abuses. . . . The proposed Complaint shall be accompanied by a signed statement explaining, on a claim-by-claim basis, (a) whether each claim was raised in any prior action (with an appropriate citation) and (b) why each claim is not barred by collateral estoppel, res judicata, and/or an applicable immunity. If the Court determines that good cause has not been shown, the action will be dismissed *sua sponte* without further notice. If the Court also determines that sanctions are appropriate, those shall be imposed at the same time the action is dismissed.

*Id.* at 25–26.

1 This case was originally filed by Ms. Block in U.S. District Court for the Middle  
2 District of Pennsylvania. The Honorable Malachy E. Mannion noted it was “inexplicabl[e]”  
3 that Ms. Block filed in Pennsylvania, given that Plaintiff and Defendants reside in Washington  
4 State, and the claims arise from events occurring in Washington State. Dkt. #8 at 1–2. The  
5 Pennsylvania Court ruled that “plaintiff’s Complaint and her Amended Complaint both indicate  
6 that the crux of this case occurred in Washington State, and the addition of a single  
7 Pennsylvania defendant, along with a threadbare factual basis of liability, does not suffice to  
8 keep this action out of the venue in which it rightfully belongs.” *Id.* at 8. The case was then  
9 transferred here. This Court agrees with Judge Mannion’s analysis and will not revisit the issue  
10 of venue.  
11

12  
13 The Court finds that the April 13, 2016, Bar Order applies to this case even though it  
14 was originally filed in the Middle District of Pennsylvania. Accordingly, Ms. Block SHALL  
15 SHOW CAUSE why this case should not be dismissed pursuant to that Bar Order.  
16 Specifically, Ms. Block must respond with a signed statement explaining, on a claim-by-claim  
17 basis, (a) whether each claim was raised in any prior action (with an appropriate citation) and  
18 (b) why each claim is not barred by collateral estoppel, res judicata, and/or an applicable  
19 immunity. The Response **is due no later than 14 days** from the date of this Order and may not  
20 exceed **8 pages**. No attachments are permitted. Failure to file this Response will result in  
21 dismissal.  
22

23  
24 DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2018.

25  
26  
27 

28 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE