

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

8 JAYDEANE FRANCIS ELL,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 JASON BENNETT,

12 Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-01358-JNW

ORDER ADOPTING R&R, DENYING  
APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN  
FORMA PAUPERIS, AND  
DISMISSING CASE

13  
14 This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation  
15 (“R&R”) of the Honorable Theresa L. Fricke, U.S. Magistrate Judge, regarding pro  
16 se Petitioner Jaydeane Francis Ell’s application to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP)  
17 and proposed habeas petition. Dkt. No. 6.

18 On October 7, 2024, after reviewing Ell’s proposed habeas petition, Judge  
19 Fricke found that “[u]nless one or more of the circumstances described in 28 U.S.C.  
20 § 2244(d)(1)(B)-(D) applies,” the petition was time barred. Dkt. No. 5 at 4; *see* 28  
21 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1) (“A 1-year period of limitation shall apply to an application for a  
22 writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State  
23 court.”); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(B)-(D) (describing circumstances that allow

**ORDER ADOPTING R&R, DENYING APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS, AND  
DISMISSING CASE - 1**

1 the statute of limitations period to run from a date later than “the date on which the  
2 judgment became final”). Judge Fricke ordered Ell to show cause as to why his  
3 proposed habeas petition should not be dismissed on this ground. Dkt. No. 5.

4 Ell failed to reply. *See* Dkt. Based on this failure, on November 15, 2024,  
5 Judge Fricke recommended dismissal of Ell’s case for failure to prosecute and  
6 failure to comply with a Court Order. Dkt. No. 6. Then, on January 16, 2025, Ell  
7 filed a proposed motion for relief from judgment, objecting to the Court’s adoption of  
8 the R&R, as well as to the Magistrate Judge’s entry of judgment. Dkt. No. 7.

9 On February 3, 2025, the Court issued an Order to Show Cause, explaining  
10 that Ell’s proposed motion was mistaken: “[T]he Court ha[d] not adopted the R&R,  
11 and Judge Fricke did not issue judgment.” Dkt. No. 8 at 5. Nevertheless, the Court  
12 found that “Ell’s filing—its apparent confusedness notwithstanding—indicates that  
13 he has not abandoned prosecution of this action.” *Id.* Therefore, the Court was “not  
14 inclined” at that time “to dismiss for failure to prosecute.” *Id.* But still, the Court  
15 agreed with Judge Fricke’s conclusion that Ell “provides no argument as to why his  
16 petition should not be dismissed as time barred.” *Id.* The Court therefore instructed  
17 Ell to show cause in writing, within 30 days, as to why “one of the circumstances  
18 described in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(B)-(D)” —or equitable tolling—should save his  
19 claim from the applicable time bar. *Id.*

20 The deadline for Ell’s response has passed, and he has not replied. *See* Dkt.  
21 Therefore, the Court APPROVES and ADOPTS IN FULL the R&R, Dkt. No. 6;  
22 DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE this case for failure to prosecute and failure  
23 to comply with court orders; DENIES Ell’s Application to Proceed In Forma

1 Pauperis, Dkt. No. 1; and DIRECTS the Clerk of Court to ENTER JUDGMENT and  
2 CLOSE THIS CASE.

3 It is so ORDERED.

4 Dated this 7th day of March, 2025.

5 

6 Jamal N. Whitehead  
7 United States District Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23