McDaniels v. Stewart et al Doc. 171

1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 AT TACOMA 7 PETER J. MCDANIELS, 8 CASE NO. C15-5943BHS-DWC Plaintiff. 9 ORDER ADOPTING REPORT v. AND RECOMMENDATION 10 BELINDA STEWART, et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 This matter comes before the Court on the order of the Honorable David W. 14 Christel, United States Magistrate Judge (Dkt. 132), and Plaintiff Peter McDaniels' 15 ("McDaniels") objections to the order (Dkt. 143). 16 On October 31, 2016, McDaniels filed a motion to file an overlength motion 17 requesting leave to file a 64-page motion for preliminary injunction. Dkt. 118. On 18 November 17, 2016, Judge Christel denied the motion concluding that McDaniels had 19 failed to show sufficient case for the additional 40 pages. Dkt. 132. On November 30, 20 2016, McDaniels filed objections. Dkt. 143 21 22

When a party objects to a nondispositive order, the "district judge in the case must consider timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). In this case, McDaniels fails to show that any part of Judge Christel's order is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law. Judge Christel has wide discretion to control the length of filings in his cases, and McDaniels has failed to show that Judge Christel abused that discretion in this instance. Therefore, the Court having considered the order, McDaniels' objections, and the remaining record, does hereby find and order that the objections are **DENIED**. Dated this 24th day of January, 2017. United States District Judge