

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

6 JOE JW ROBERTS, JR,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 TIM THRASHER, et al.,

10 Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-00376-RSM-BAT

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
REGARDING OBJECTIONS**

11 On February 23, 2021, Plaintiff filed a motion asking, "why hasn't the court responded
12 to my objection." Dkt. 114. Plaintiff's inquiry flows from motions he filed on December 23,
13 2021 that mental illness was interfering his ability to litigate, defendants are trying to sabotage
14 Plaintiff and demanding a jury. Dkts. 78, 79, and 80. The motions were noted for January 8,
15 2021 and Defendants filed a response on January 4, 2021. Dkt. 81. On January 11, 2021
16 Plaintiff filed a reply to Defendants' response which the Court finds does not alter the denial of
17 Plaintiff's motions. On January 25, 2021, Plaintiff filed an objection to defendants' response
18 indicating the prison e-filed his reply late and he was not given enough time to file a reply. Dkt.
19 83.

20 Plaintiff's objections are unfounded. He presents nothing showing defendants' response
21 was not timely filed or somehow improper. As to the timeliness of Plaintiff's reply, although
22 Plaintiff states it takes days for the prison to e-file a pleading, he nonetheless waited until
23 January 7, 2021 to submit his reply, resulting in an untimely filing. The Court in any event

1 reviewed Plaintiff's Reply when it was filed on January 12, 2021 and concluded it did not alter
2 the order entered the day before.

3 The clerk shall provide a copy of this order to the parties.

4 DATED this 25th day of February 2021.

5
6 

7

BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
United States Magistrate Judge