- FILED LODGED ____ RECEIVED

JAN 23 1990

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

LINCOLN LANE ADDLEMAN, JR.,

Plaintiff,

3

4

6

7

9

10

15

16

17

18

22

CASE NO. C90-1WD

ORDER

WASHINGTON SENTENCING GUIDELINES COMMISSION, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Addleman has submitted documents to this Court by which he seeks to file an action pro se and in forma pauperis against numerous defendants on the Washington Sentencing Guidelines Commission. The Court, having reviewed these documents, does hereby find and ORDER:

- (1) Plaintiff's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED.
- (2) Plaintiff's claims are dismissed as frivolous, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(d). The plaintiff has submitted eight other complaints or petitions for writ of habeas corpus in this Court since 1987, as well as twenty complaints or petitions in the Eastern

Addleman v. Dolliver, C87-335B; Addleman v. Board of Prison 23 Terms and Paroles, C87-363T; Addleman v. Washington State Penitentiary, C87-1661M; Addleman v. Dailey, C88-661R, Addleman v. Marsh, C89-534B; Addleman v. Washington State et al., C89-817C; Addleman v. 25 Merritt, C89-1430R; and, Addleman v. Reser, C89-1629R.

26 ORDER - 1

Rev.8/82

District of Washington since 1982. While this number is not of itself excessive, many of these complaints are repetitious or duplicative. Plaintiff has repeatedly sued or attempted to sue court clerks and judges for acts within the scope of their judicial role. Plaintiff has attempted to attack his sentence not only directly by challenging the Washington Sentence Reform Act, but also by suing the governor, state legislators, judges, and others who participated in passage of the SRA or in formulating the sentencing guidelines. This complaint represents but one more such case. Most of the allegations made here appeared previously in other suits by plaintiff. Moreover, the documents which plaintiff submitted in this case

11 Addleman v. Washington State Dept. of Corrections, et al., C-82-339-JLQ; Addleman v. Kincheloe and Attorney General of 12 Washington, C-82-844-JLQ; Addleman v. State of Washington, Reed, and Attorney General of Washington, C-82-845-JLQ; Addleman v. Reed. 13 Kautzky, Spalding, et al., C-83-635-RJM; Addleman, et al. v. Reed, Kincheloe, and Smith, C-83-683-RJM; Addleman v. Kincheloe and Reed, 14 C-84-480-RJM; Addleman v. Federline, C-84-126-RJM; Addleman v. Ponti, C-84-476-RJM; Addleman v. Hansen, et al., C-86-134-RJM; Addleman v. 15 Hansen, Dever, Riveland, Glassley, and Kincheloe, C-87-292-JLQ; Addleman v. Riveland, Kincheloe, Burt, Moses, and Hansen, 16 C-87-329-AAM; Addleman v. Kincheloe, Dever, Hansen, Zohner, C-87-500-RJM; Addleman v. Board of Prison Terms and Paroles, 17 C-87-498-AAM (transferred from Western District); Addleman v. Board of Prison Terms and Paroles, C-88-526-RJM; Addleman v. State of 18 Washington, Gardner, Bail, Kincheloe, 1986 and 1987 Legislatures, et al., C-87-793-RJM; Addleman v. Riveland, Peterson, Montgomery, Sorenson, and Taylor, C-88-*-RJM; Addleman v. State of Washington and Supt. Blodgett, C-89-492-AAM/M; Addleman v. State of Washington, 20 Kincheloe, Menke, and Erdman, C-89-533-RJM; Addleman v. State of <u>Washington, Riveland, et al., C-89-527-JLQ; Addleman v. Judge Alan A.</u> McDonald, C-89-746-JLQ. 21

³Addleman v. Merritt, C89-1430R; Addleman v. Dolliver, C87-335B; Addleman v. Reser, C89-1629R; Addleman v. Judge Alan A. McDonald, C-89-746-JLQ.

4C-87-498-AAM; C-88-526-RJM.

⁵C-87-793-RJM.

26 ORDER - 2

22

23

24

25

3

5

10

are wholly unsubstantial and incomprehensible and reveal no basis upon which the Court can perceive any meritorious claims.

- Plaintiff is placing a great burden on the Court by reason of the large number of filings and attempted filings, and the Court finds that plaintiff is abusing his privilege to proceed in forma Plaintiff, may in the future, file actions only in accordance with the procedure set out in paragraphs (4) and (5).
- The Court hereby adopts a special procedure whereby any (4) future requests by plaintiff to proceed in forma pauperis in the Western District of Washington at Seattle or in Tacoma will be denied, except upon a showing of good cause to the Court's satisfaction as to why plaintiff should be permitted to sue on a particular cause of action at public expense. Graham v. Riddle, 554 F.2d 133 (4th Cir. 1977).
- With respect to all cases which plaintiff seeks to file pro se and in forma pauperis any civil rights case or petition for writ of habeas corpus in the Western District of Washington, he must;
 - Submit all forms required by Local Rules CR 3 and CR 103 and the Rules Governing Habeas Corpus in the United States District Court:
 - Answer all questions on the required forms completely and directly;
 - (c) Additionally submit, with respect to any petition for writ of habeas corpus, specific, affirmative evidence that he has exhausted available state remedies with respect to the particular issues raised; and,

26 ORDER - 3

1

2

3

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AO 72 (Rev.8/82) (6) Upon receipt of any new case for filing, the Clerk shall direct the documents to the appropriate magistrate's office for determination of whether the filing complies with the requirements of this Order.

(7) The Clerk shall furnish copies of this Order to plaintiff Addleman, to the Attorney General of the State of Washington, and to each full-time United States Magistrate.

DATED this 23 day of

_, 1990.

Recommended for Entry this 18th day of January, 1990.

United States MagDstrate

Philip K. Sweigert

Q

ORDER - 4