

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

10 DONALD E. MORISKY,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 MMAS RESEARCH LLC, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:21-CV-1301-RSM-DWC

ORDER ON MOTION FOR
VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL

15 The District Court referred this action to United States Magistrate Judge David W.
16 Christel. Dkt. 25. Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Voluntary Dismissal
17 Without Prejudice Pursuant to FRCP 41. Dkt. 32.

18 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41 sets forth the circumstances under which an action
19 may be dismissed. Under Rule 41(a)(1), an action may be voluntarily dismissed without
20 prejudice by the plaintiff if the plaintiff files a notice of dismissal before the defendant files an
21 answer or summary judgment motion and the plaintiff has not previously dismissed an action
22 "based on or including the same claim." Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(a)(1); *Wilson v. City of San Jose*, 111
23 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997). Once the defendant has responded to the complaint, the action
24

1 may only be dismissed by stipulation of dismissal signed by all parties who have appeared or “by
2 court order, on terms that the court considers proper.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(a)(1), (2).

3 Here, Plaintiff seeks to voluntarily dismiss Defendants Rodney Watkins and Dustin
4 Machi without prejudice. Dkt. 32. Defendants Watkins and Machi have not filed an answer or
5 summary judgment motion. Rather, Defendants Watkins and Machi have only filed motions to
6 dismiss. *See* Dkt. 19, 20. Further, while Plaintiff and other Defendants have been named in
7 related cases, the parties do not assert, nor does the Court find, that Plaintiff has previously
8 dismissed an action against Defendants Watkins and Machi “based on or including the same
9 claim.” Thus, Plaintiff may voluntarily dismiss Defendants Watkins and Machi without a Court
10 order.¹

11 Therefore, the Court construes the Motion for Voluntary Dismissal (Dkt. 32) as a Notice
12 of Voluntary Dismissal. The Clerk is directed to terminate Defendants Watkins and Machi based
13 on the Notice (Dkt. 32).

14 Dated this 10th day of January, 2022.

15 
16 _____

17 David W. Christel
18 United States Magistrate Judge
19
20
21
22
23

24 ¹ Defendants Watkins and Machi do not oppose to the Motion for Voluntary Dismissal and have not
asserted dismissal under Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(a)(1) is improper.