

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

**Brittney C. Boyd v. International Union of Operating Engineers
Local 701, et al.**

Boyd · No. 2:25-cv-01225-LK · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington addresses Plaintiff Brittney C. Boyd’s repeated procedurally improper and allegedly frivolous filings. The Court strikes her notice of supplemental authority, denies her emergency motion to compel and motion for a temporary restraining order, and orders her to show cause why the case should not be dismissed with prejudice. The order requires a response by January 8, 2026 and warns that continued violations of court rules and orders may result in dismissal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Lauren King
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01225-LK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court sua sponte considered sanctions and dismissal based on Plaintiff’s repeated violations of procedural rules and court orders. The court struck a notice of supplemental authority, denied an emergency motion to compel and a motion for a temporary restraining order, and ordered Plaintiff to show cause within 21 days why the case should not be dismissed with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to comply with court orders is committed to the district court’s discretion. In considering dismissal, the court weighs the public interest in expeditious resolution, the court’s need to manage its docket, the risk of prejudice to defendants, the public policy favoring decisions on the merits, and the availability of less drastic sanctions.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Brittney C. Boyd v. International Union of Operating Engineers Local 701, et al.

TOPICS

sanctions civil procedure pleadings discovery dispute injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure employment law ERISA

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's notice of supplemental authority should be stricken as an improper attempt to amend or supplement the complaint and as a frivolous filing.
2. Whether Plaintiff's emergency motion to compel should be denied for violating discovery procedures and prior court orders.
3. Whether Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order should be denied for failing to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(1)(B).
4. Whether Plaintiff should be ordered to show cause why the action should not be dismissed with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the court's inherent authority.

HOLDINGS

1. The notice of supplemental authority was procedurally improper and was stricken because it did not support a pending motion, attempted to supplement or amend the complaint, and sought to revive claims previously dismissed with prejudice.
2. The emergency motion to compel was denied because Plaintiff sought discovery before the Rule 26(f) conference, failed to meet and confer with Defendants, and failed to provide the certification required by the local discovery rule.
3. The motion for a temporary restraining order was denied because it failed to describe efforts to give notice to Defendants or provide reasons why notice should not be required.
4. The court ordered Plaintiff to show cause within 21 days why the case should not be dismissed with prejudice because her repeated frivolous filings and violations of court orders demonstrated continued disregard of procedural requirements despite repeated warnings.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Ms. Boyd is therefore ORDERED to show cause within 21 days why the Court should not dismiss her case with prejudice.” (at 7)

“For the foregoing reasons, the Court STRIKES Ms. Boyd’s Notice of Supplemental Authority, Dkt. No. 63; DENIES Ms. Boyd’s motion to compel, Dkt. No. 64; DENIES Ms. Boyd’s motion for a TRO, Dkt. No. 66; and

ORDERS her to show cause by January 8, 2026 why her case should not be dismissed with prejudice.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff repeatedly filed sprawling and duplicative complaints, motions, declarations, exhibits, and other documents despite orders directing her to file one operative amended complaint and comply with federal and local procedural rules. She sought discovery before the parties' Rule 26(f) conference and without the required meet-and-confer certification, filed motions for temporary restraining orders without complying with Rule 65(b)(1)(B)'s notice certification, and attempted to revive previously dismissed criminal RICO claims through a notice of supplemental authority. The court found that many submissions were frivolous, procedurally improper, irrational, or wholly incredible, and that Plaintiff continued violating prior warnings and orders.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed multiple voluminous and procedurally improper complaints, motions, exhibits, and supplemental submissions. The court repeatedly dismissed or struck filings, denied requested relief, gave Plaintiff leave to file one final amended complaint, and warned that continued violations could result in sanctions, including dismissal. After Plaintiff again filed an improper notice, motion to compel, and motion for a temporary restraining order, the court issued this order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Muñoz v. United States, 28 F.4th 973, 978 (9th Cir. 2022)
- Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992)
- De Long v. Hennessey, 912 F.2d 1144, 1148 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005)
- Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986) (per curiam)
- Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 44-45 (1991)
- In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig., 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv., 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Valley Eng'rs Inc. v. Elec. Eng'g Co., 158 F.3d 1051, 1057 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Smith v. Legacy Partners, Inc., No. 2:21-CV-00629-JHC, 2022 WL 2135369, at *1 (W.D. Wash. June 14, 2022)
- Jacobsen v. Filler, 790 F.2d 1362, 1365 n.5 (9th Cir. 1986)