

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 STEVE HOBBS,

12 Defendant.

Case No. C25-6078-SKV

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

13  
14 The Complaint in this matter was filed on December 2, 2025. *See* Dkt. 1. As of March  
15 10, 2026, no proof of service had been filed, and the Court ordered Plaintiff to file proof of  
16 timely service upon Defendant or to show cause as to why this matter should not be dismissed.  
17 *See* Dkt. 8. Plaintiff failed to comply, leaving the status of this case unclear and compelling  
18 further inquiry by this Court.

19 On March 17, 2026, Plaintiff filed proof of an *untimely* service attempt without  
20 explanation. *See* Dkt. 9. The form filed indicates that a process server “left the summons at the  
21 individual’s residence or usual place of abode with Mia Doe, a person of suitable age and  
22 discretion who resides at 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000, Seattle, WA 98104, on 03/13/2026 at  
23 11:08 AM, and mailed a copy to the individual’s last known address[.]” Dkt. 9. It further states

1 that the process server “delivered the documents, Complaint; Summons; EXHIBITS, to an  
2 individual who refused to give their name who identified themselves as the designee authorized  
3 to accept service. The individual accepted service with direct delivery. The individual appeared  
4 to be a brown-haired white female contact 25-35 years of age, 5’4”-5’6” tall and weighing 80-  
5 120 lbs.” *Id.*

6 Within hours of that filing, counsel for Defendant appeared and filed a notice informing  
7 the Court that: (1) “800 Fifth Avenue is the address of the Washington Attorney General’s  
8 Seattle Office; it is not the residence or usual place of abode of Secretary Hobbs[;]” (2) the form  
9 “does not indicate that the person with whom the complaint and summons was left was  
10 authorized to accept service on behalf of Secretary Hobbs[;]” (3) “Plaintiff also sought to  
11 electronically serve Secretary Hobbs on Thursday March 12, 2026, for which counsel for  
12 Secretary Hobbs responded by providing a waiver of service under Federal Rule of Civil  
13 Procedure 4(d)[]” the following day; and (4) “[o]n March 17, 2026, wholly different counsel  
14 sought to electronically serve Secretary Hobbs without acknowledging the Secretary’s waiver or  
15 copying counsel for Secretary Hobbs on that communication.”<sup>1</sup> Dkt. 14 at 2. In that March 17  
16 email, an Assistant United States Attorney who has not appeared in this action indicates that  
17 Plaintiff “require[s] an Acknowledgement of Service and cannot accept a Waiver.” *Id.* at 6.  
18 Defendant does not indicate whether he responded to Plaintiffs’ March 17 email.

19 It is now clear that Plaintiff did *not* timely serve Defendant. It remains unclear whether  
20 service of process on Defendant has actually been effected and how. As of yesterday, Plaintiff  
21 apparently continued to attempt service while disregarding Defendant’s waiver and representing  
22  
23

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that “Mia Doe” likely does not reside at the Washington Attorney General’s Seattle Office either.

1 to the Court that it had already served him on March 13. If service has been effected, it is not  
2 clear which attempt, on which date, governs.


3 In view of the foregoing, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to SHOW CAUSE by March 23,  
4 2026, as to why:

- 5 1) Plaintiff failed to comply with this Court's March 10 Order to Show Cause  
6 instructing it to file proof of *timely* service or to show cause as to why this matter  
7 should not be dismissed; and  
8 2) Plaintiff failed to seek an extension of time to serve Defendant supported by a  
9 showing of good cause, if any. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

10 Plaintiff is FURTHER ORDERED to:

- 11 3) clarify on what date it claims to have served Defendant, and through what means; and  
12 4) if service on Defendant was by any other means than that referenced at Docket No. 9,  
13 explain why it made an inaccurate representation to this Court.

14 Dated this 18th day of March, 2026.

15 

16 S. KATE VAUGHAN  
17 United States Magistrate Judge