2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 10 AT TACOMA 11 ROBERT J. KING, CASE NO. C11-5269RBL/JRC 12 Plaintiff. ORDER ASKING THE PARTIES FOR 13 v. CLARIFICATION AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR 14 **CLALLAM BAY CORRECTIONS** ALTERNATE SERVICE CENTER, et al., 15 16 Defendants. 17 This is a state tort action with a civil rights claim in it and not, as the Attorney General's 18 Office asserts, solely a federal cause of action (ECF No. 1, page 2 ¶ 5). Therefore, further 19 clarification is required. 20 The Attorney General's Office removed the action from state court because of the federal 21 claim (ECF No. 1). Plaintiff states that all defendants, except Physician Assistant Gregory C. 22 Miller, have been personally served (ECF No. 11). Plaintiff has a motion pending asking the 23 court to serve defendant Miller (ECF No. 11). Mr. Miller no longer works for the Washington 24 25 State Department of Corrections and plaintiff does not have a current address for Mr. Miller. 26 Plaintiff asks that the Attorney General's Office accept service on behalf of Mr. Miller (ECF No.

11). Plaintiff argues that the defendant is being sued in his official capacity pursuant to RCW 4.92.020.

The Attorney General's Office has withdrawn from the representation of Mr. Miller and Mr. Miller is now represented by William H. Walsh and Margaret J. Pak (ECF No. 8 and 9). Plaintiff has filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, which if granted would obligate the court to attempt service on Mr. Miller on plaintiff's behalf.

Before considering the motion to proceed in forma pauperis, the court needs to inquire from the parties if service of process on Mr. Miller is still an issue in this action. If Mr. Miller is not contesting service of process, then there is no need for the court to grant in forma pauperis status in this action, since the filing fee has been paid and service has apparently been completed on the other defendants. Therefore, Mr. Miller's counsel will inform the court if their client is contesting service of process on or before July 15, 2011.

The motion for substitute service, (ECF No. 11), is DENIED. The Washington State Attorney General's Office may accept service on behalf of the state itself, or the state in a state tort action, but that does not make it proper for the Attorney General's Office to accept service on behalf of a person who is now represented by another attorney.

The motion to proceed in forma pauperis, (ECF No. 14), is re-noted on the court's own motion for July 15, 2011.

DATED this 21st day of June, 2011.

J. Richard Creatura

United States Magistrate Judge