

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

GARRETT LINDERMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

RUBEN CEDENO, DEVON SCHRUM,
KAREN BRUNSON, TAMARA
ROWDEN, CAIN (FNU), SMITH
(FNU), CARROLL RIDDLE, T.
SCHNEIDER, McTARSNEY (FNU),
PALMER (FNU), MOSELY (FNU),
WINTERS (FNU), ASHTON (FNU),
NESBITT (FNU), MOHN (FNU),
MILLER (FNU), JANE/JOHN DOES,
and L. SCHNEIDER,

Defendants.

No. C10-5897 RBL/KLS

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
SUPPLEMENT COMPLAINT AND
GRANTING EXTENSION OF TIME TO
PROVIDE SERVICE ADDRESSES

This case has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Karen L. Strombom pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local MJR 3 and 4. Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. ECF No. 4. Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Supplement Complaint and for Extension of Time to Complete Service on the five defendants who have not yet been served. ECF No. 27.

ORDER - 1

1 Plaintiff Garrett Linderman is a Washington State inmate who has filed a 42 U.S.C. §
2 1983 civil rights action alleging that numerous Department of Corrections (DOC) officials
3 retaliated against him for filing lawsuits and grievances. All the Defendants who have been
4 served with process have answered Plaintiff's complaint. The Defendants who have not been
5 served are Defendants Ruben Cedeno, Karen Brunson, Lester Schneider, Miller and Ashton.
6 Plaintiff has now identified the last two Defendants as Michael Miller and Karin Ashton.
7 Plaintiff now moves to supplement his complaint to provide the Defendants' first names and for
8 an extension of time to serve those Defendants who have not yet been served.
9

10 Plaintiff's request to supplement his complaint to provide the first names of various
11 named Defendants is unnecessary as all Defendants who have been served have provided their
12 first names in their answer and these names match the first names now provided by the Plaintiff
13 in his motion to supplement. Therefore, the motion to supplement is denied.
14

15 However, Plaintiff has shown good cause for an extension of time within which to serve
16 the Defendants who have not yet been served. *See* Civil Rule 4(m). Accordingly, Plaintiff shall
17 provide the court with the addresses of the remaining Defendants **on or before May 27, 2011**.
18 Plaintiff is advised that the Clerk will direct service once the addresses are received.

19 The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants.
20 The Clerk shall also send Plaintiff a copy of the docket.

21 **DATED** this 5th day of April, 2011.

22
23 
24 Karen L. Strombom
25 United States Magistrate Judge
26