

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FEB 22 2018

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JAN VAN DUSEN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CATHERINE D. PURCELL, Presiding
Judge of the State Bar Court, San Francisco;
et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-16983

D.C. No. 3:16-cv-04976-LB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Laurel D. Beeler, Magistrate Judge, Presiding

Submitted February 13, 2018**

Before: LEAVY, FERNANDEZ, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

Jan Van Dusen, an attorney, appeals pro se from the magistrate judge's order dismissing her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutional claims arising out of her interim suspension from the practice of law in the State of California. We have

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo whether the magistrate judge validly entered judgment on behalf of the district court. *Allen v. Meyer*, 755 F.3d 866, 867-68 (9th Cir. 2014). We vacate and remand.

Van Dusen consented to proceed before the magistrate judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). The magistrate judge then screened and dismissed Van Dusen's action before the named defendants had been served. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). Because all parties, including unserved defendants, must consent to proceed before the magistrate judge for jurisdiction to vest, *Williams v. King*, 875 F.3d 500, 503-04 (9th Cir. 2017), we vacate the magistrate judge's order and remand for further proceedings.

VACATED and REMANDED.