1

2

4

5

SCOTT CARROLL BOLTON,

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,
OLYMPIC CORRECTIONS CENTER,
WASHINGTON STATE CORRECTIONS
CENTER, SERGEANT MATE, JANICE
PRICE, SUE GIBBS, JOHN ALDANA,
TRACY HIXON, DON EARLS, and CHAD
LEE,

Defendants.

No. C12-5658 BHS/KLS

ORDER WITHDRAWING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND DENYING PENDING MOTIONS

On November 2, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting dismissal of this case without prejudice, pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1). ECF No. 19. On November 7, 2012, the undersigned recommended that the District Court grant Plaintiff's motion. ECF No. 20. On the same day, Plaintiff filed five motions for preliminary injunctive relief, a motion for default judgment, a motion for amended claim, three motions for "order of notice", and a motion for ex parte communication. ECF Nos. 21-25, 27-33.

In his motion for ex parte communication, Plaintiff states that he filed the motion to voluntarily dismiss his case after his motion to consolidate this case with Case No. C12-5677 had been denied. He then states that "for reasons unknown to me, I'm assuming clerical error or misinterpretation," his motion for voluntary dismissal was granted. ECF No. 33 at 3-4. He asks that the Court allow his cases to survive. *Id.* at 4.

ORDER - 1

Plaintiff's motion to consolidate this case with Case No. C12-5677 was denied on October 18, 2012. On November 19, 2012, Plaintiff's claims in Case No. C12-5677 were denied without prejudice and the dismissal counted as a strike pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1915(g). ECF Nos. 9 and 10 therein. It appears that Plaintiff may have been confused as to his obligations to appropriately plead his claims in this case. Therefore, the Court will rescind its Report and Recommendation dated November 7, 2012 (ECF No. 20) and will review Plaintiff's proposed Amended Complaint filed on October 17, 2012 (ECF No. 16) to determine whether Plaintiff has stated a viable 42 U.S.C. 1983 complaint.

Plaintiff's remaining motions shall be **DENIED** as premature. The Court has not yet determined whether this case will go forward on the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 16) and no defendants have been served. Therefore, this Court has no jurisdiction over any defendants and Plaintiff's numerous motions for preliminary injunctive relief and for default are premature. To the extent Plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunctive relief, he must comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b), which provides that a Court may only issue a temporary restraining order without notice to the adverse party if (1) the facts in an affidavit or verified complaint clearly show that immediate and irreparable harm will result before the adverse party can be heard, and (2) the movant certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and reasons why it should not be required. Fed.R.Civ.P. 65(b). Plaintiff has met neither of these requirements.

Plaintiff is directed to file **no further motions** in this case until it has been determined that his claims will be allowed to go forward.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

ORDER - 2