1 2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA		
8			
9			
10	MARK WAYNE CLARK,	CASE NO. C10-5203RBL	
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S	
12	V.	MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT	
13	PAT GLEBE, <i>et al.</i> ,		
14	Defendants.		
15			
16	This matter comes before the court on plai	ntiff's letter to the clerk (Doc. 19) and	
17	plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint, (Doc. 20). The court, having reviewed the motion,		
18		-	
19	defendants' opposition, and the balance of the record, does hereby ORDER:		

The clerk has received a letter (Doc. 19) from plaintiff, in which plaintiff states concerns regarding the court's pretrial schedule and his ability to conduct discovery in a timely manner.

Plaintiff shall note that neither the clerk nor the court can provide legal assistance to a litigant. Letters addressed to the clerk asking for legal advice and clarification of a court order are inappropriate, as is any other form of ex-parte communication with the court. If plaintiff is unclear regarding the meaning of, or seeks relief from, a court order, he should serve, file, and properly note a motion seeking appropriate relief.

ORDER - 1

In the letter plaintiff states the pretrial order was premature, noting that some defendants had not yet appeared in the matter. Plaintiff asks if the schedule can be revoked or postponed. This request is **DENIED**. The parties should work diligently to meet the deadlines set by the court. If the parties are unable to complete discovery within the stated time limit, a motion may be presented at the appropriate time setting forth the reasons why the deadline needs to be extended.

Plaintiff's motion to supplement or amend his complaint (Doc. 20) is **DENIED**. Four factors are relevant to whether a motion for leave to amend pleadings should be denied: undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive, futility of amendment, and prejudice to the opposing party. <u>United States v. Webb</u>, 655 F.2d 977, 980 (9th Cir. 1981). In light of this legal standard, the court finds the proposed amendment would cause undue delay and prejudice to the opposing party.

The complaint (Doc. 3) alleges certain claims and causes of action against defendants employed at the Stafford Creek Correctional Center and the Spectrum Company, which allegedly operates a program at the correctional facility. The "Supplemental Complaint", attached to the motion to amend, seeks to add additional defendants and claims against individuals employed at Airway Heights Correctional Center, located within the jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

After reviewing the record, the undersigned finds insufficient intervening facts or circumstances to support plaintiff's motion to supplement the complaint in this fashion. To allow the additional defendants and claims to be added to the instant matter would cause unnecessary delay and complexity to the case.

1	The clerk is directed to send copies of this order to plaintiff and counsel for the	
2	defendants.	
3	DATED this 9th day of September, 2010.	
4		
5	J. hand walus	
6	J. Richard Creatura	
7	United States Magistrate Judge	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
	ORDER - 3	