

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

WILLIAM D. WEBSTER,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
KITSAP COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, et  
al.,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. C09-5036 FDB  
  
ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
FILE 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDED COMPLAINT

This matter comes before the Court on motion of Plaintiff to file a 2<sup>nd</sup> Amended Complaint. Although Plaintiff has not provided this Court, nor the Defendants, with a copy of the proposed amendment, his motion apparently seeks to name "Kitsap County" as a Defendant.

Although Defendants have not been served with a copy of the proposed 2<sup>nd</sup> Amended Complaint, Defendants do not oppose the naming of Kitsap County as a proper defendant. Defendants do oppose any additional amendments to the complaint that have not been set forth in the motion.

The Court finds it appropriate to permit amendment of the complaint for the sole purpose of

1 naming Kitsap County as a party defendant.<sup>1</sup>

2 ACCORDINGLY:

3 IT IS ORDERED:

4 Plaintiff's Motion to File 2<sup>nd</sup> Amended Complaint [Dkt. # 22] is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff shall  
5 serve and file the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amended Complaint naming Kitsap County as a defendant no later  
6 than October 9, 2009

7 DATED this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of October, 2009.

8

9

10



11

FRANKLIN D. BURGESS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

---

1.Plaintiff has also filed a Motion for Sanctions regarding the scheduling of a joint status conference [Dkt. #23]. Plaintiff's motion is without merit. Status conferences are generally conducted telephonically and in this matter is appropriate. The motion for sanctions is **DENIED**.