

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL D. HARRISON,	CASE NO. 1:08-cv-1065-MJS (PC)
Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR COURT
v.	ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO PROVIDE
ADAMS, et al.,	AND SEND DOCUMENTS FOR PLAINTIFF
Defendants.	TO EFFECTUATE SERVICE ON
	DEFENDANTS
	(ECF No. 53)

Plaintiff Michael D. Harrison ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Plaintiff has filed a Motion for Court Order Directing Clerk of this Court to Provide and Send Documents for Plaintiff to Effect Service on all Defendants in this Action. He asks the Court to Order the Marshal to serve his Complaint on Defendants. Plaintiff contends that, notwithstanding his repeated requests for screening, his case has been awaiting screening since 2008. He now seeks to have the screening process skipped and that he be given forms to use to effect service of the Complaint on Defendants.

The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The Court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from

1 such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1),(2). This provision is mandatory; the Court cannot
2 exempt Plaintiff's action from the screening requirements. The Court will direct the United
3 States Marshal to serve Plaintiff's Complaint only after the Court has screened the
4 Complaint and determined that it contains cognizable claims for relief against the named
5 Defendants.

6 The Court will screen Plaintiff's complaint in due course, but Plaintiff is advised that
7 this court has an extremely large number of prisoner civil rights cases pending before it.
8 The Court can not and will not select one, such as his, for priority treatment.

9 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order Directing Clerk to Provide Service
10 Documents is DENIED.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: November 8, 2010

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28