

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR
2
3
4
5
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 JOHN ROBERT DEMOS, JR.,

CASE NO. C22-5793-JCC

11 v. Plaintiff,

ORDER

12 JAY INSLEE, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

14

15 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's objection (Dkt. No. 3) to the Report and
16 Recommendation ("R&R") of the Honorable David W. Christel, United States Magistrate Judge
17 (Dkt. No. 2). Judge Christel's R&R recommends that Plaintiff's proposed complaint be
18 dismissed without prejudice for non-compliance with the 1992 Bar Order. (*See* Dkt. No. 2.) The
19 R&R summarizes the proposed complaint's allegations, the Bar Order's conditions, and
20 Plaintiff's suits within this District. (*See* Dkt. No. 2 at 1–3.) The Court need not repeat that
21 information here.

22 Plaintiff's objection to the R&R takes issue with the Bar Order and its conditions—not
23 the R&R's interpretation of the Order. (*See* Dkt. No. 3.) This collateral attack of the Bar Order is
24 not responsive to the analysis or conclusions contained within the R&R and, therefore, does not

1 trigger this Court's review of the R&R.¹

2 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that:

- 3 1. Plaintiff's objection to the R&R (Dkt. No. 3) is OVERRULED;
- 4 2. The R&R (Dkt. No. 2) is ADOPTED and APPROVED;
- 5 3. The proposed complaint (Dkt. No. 1-1) is DISMISSED without prejudice;
- 6 4. The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. No. 1) is DENIED; and
- 7 5. The Clerk is DIRECTED to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and to Judge

8 Christel.

9 DATED this 18th day of November 2022.



10
11 John C. Coughenour
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 ¹ A district court only reviews those portions of an R&R to which a party properly objects. *See*
23 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Objections are required to enable the court to
24 “focus attention on those issues—factual and legal—that are at the heart of the parties’ dispute.”
Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985). The court is not required to review “any issue that is
25 not the subject of an objection.” *Id.* at 149. Said another way, for an objection to be proper, it
26 must point to specific error contained within the R&R. *See, e.g., United States v. Diaz-Lemus*,
2010 WL 2573748, slip op. at 1 (D. Ariz. 2010); *see Djelassi v. ICE Field Office Director*, 434
F. Supp. 3d 917, 919 (W.D. Wash. 2020).