

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT TACOMA

10 CHARLES ROBINSON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 WASHINGTON STATE SPECIAL
14 COMMITMENT CENTER CHIEF
MEDICAL DIRECTOR, DR. LESLIE
15 SZIEBERT; WASHINGTON STATE
SPECIAL COMMITMENT CENTER,
16 GALINA DIXON, ARNP, and JOHN
DOES 1-25 and JANE DOES 1-25,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:15-CV-05555-RJB-DWC

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO
PROVIDE COURT WITH
ADDRESSES

18 Plaintiff, a Washington State civilly-committed detainee proceeding *pro se*, filed this
19 civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on August 6, 2015. Dkt. 1.¹ On November 27,
20

21
22 ¹ Plaintiff previously filed this action in conjunction with three other civilly-committed
23 detainees. Based upon the allegations in the complaint, the Court determined Plaintiffs' claims
24 did not satisfy the requirements for permissive joinder articulated in Federal Rules of Civil
Procedure 20 and 21. *See Mitchell, et. al., v. State of Washington et al.*, 3:15-cv-05226-RBL-
DWC, Dkt. 5, 8 (W.D. Wash. 2015). The Court entered an order separating the claims of the four

1 2015, Plaintiff filed a Motion requesting the Court serve a summons and a copy of his complaint
2 on Defendant Galina Dixon, ARNP. Dkt. 16. However, Plaintiff also names John Does 1-25 and
3 Jane Does 1-25 (“Doe defendants”) as defendants in this action. The use of “John Doe” to
4 identify a defendant is not favored. *Gillespie v. Civiletti*, 629 F.2d 637, 642 (9th Cir. 1980).
5 Although a plaintiff may be given an opportunity after filing a lawsuit to discover the identity of
6 unknown defendants through discovery, the use of Doe defendants is problematic because those
7 persons cannot be served with process until they are identified by their real names.²

8 Plaintiff is ordered to provide the names and addresses of the Doe defendants within 30
9 days of the date of this order. If Plaintiff is unable to provide the Court with names and addresses
10 of the Doe defendants in that timeframe, the Court will recommend dismissal of the Doe
11 defendants from the case without prejudice.

12 Dated this 14th day of December, 2015.

13 

14 David W. Christel
15 United States Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20

21 Plaintiffs, ordering Plaintiff Mitchell to file an amended complaint addressing only his individual
22 claims, and dismissing the other Plaintiffs from the action without prejudice. *Id.*

23 ² Also, though Plaintiff lists the Doe defendants in the case caption, they are otherwise
24 unmentioned in the complaint or named in Plaintiff’s causes of action. If Plaintiff is able to
identify additional defendants and claims through discovery, he may be allowed to amend his
complaint to add those defendants and claims at that time.