| 1 | | |
|----|---|----------------------------|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON | |
| 10 | AT SEA | ATTLE |
| 11 | IVAN GABRIEL ISLAS, | Case No. 2:24-CV-00493-JHC |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | ORDER |
| 13 | V. | |
| 14 | BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., | |
| 15 | Defendant. | |
| 16 | THIS MATTER comes before the Court on pro se Plaintiff's motions at Dkt. ## 28 and | |
| 17 | 29. Defendant did not file an opposition to either motion. The Court has reviewed the motions, | |
| 18 | the rest of the file, and the governing law. Being fully advised, the Court rules as follows: | |
| 19 | With respect to both motion documents, to the extent that they are submissions in | |
| 20 | opposition to Defendant's pending motion to dismiss at Dkt. # 26, the Court will consider them | |
| 21 | as such. See LCR 7. | |
| 22 | With respect to the motion at Dkt. # 28, to the extent it is a motion for leave to amend the | |
| 23 | complaint, the Court DENIES it as it does not attach a copy of the proposed amended pleading as | |
| 24 | an exhibit. See LCR 15(a). To the extent it is a discovery motion, the Court DENIES it for | |
| 25 | failure to comply with the discovery rules of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Fed. R. | |
| 26 | Civ. P. 26 to 37. | |
| | ORDER - 1 | |

With respect to the motion at Dkt. # 29, to the extent it is a motion for leave to amend the
complaint, the Court DENIES it without prejudice. The portion of the motion that appears to be
the proposed amended complaint, Dkt. # 29 at 3-7, is handwritten and the Court does not find it
to be completely legible. The Court notes that Plaintiff is able to type submissions to the Court.
See, e.g., Dkt. # 28.

DATED this 27th day of January, 2025.

A. Chun

JOHN'H. CHUN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ORDER - 2