

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

JAMES R. WILLIS,

1:09-cv-01703-AWI-GSA-PC

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
MOTION TO EXPEDITE SCREENING OF
SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT
(Doc. 17.)

v.

HARLEY G. LAPPIN, et al.,

Defendants.

James R. Willis (“plaintiff”) is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to Bivens vs. Six Unknown Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Plaintiff filed the complaint commencing this action on September 28, 2009. (Doc. 1.) On January 19, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion for leave to amend or supplement the complaint, along with a proposed First Amended Complaint, which was filed by the Clerk on January 19, 2010. (Docs. 7, 8.) On April 26, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion for leave to clarify his prayer for relief in the complaint, and on May 21, 2010, the court granted plaintiff’s motion. (Docs. 12, 15.) On June 8, 2008, plaintiff filed a Second Amended Complaint, along with a request for the court to expedite the screening of the complaint, because “[T]he events giving rise to the complaint happened almost ‘3 years’ ago.” (Docs. 16, 17.)

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).

1 The court screens complaints in the order in which they are filed and strives to avoid delays
2 whenever possible. Plaintiff 's Second Amended Complaint was filed less than a week ago and
3 will be screened in due time. Plaintiff has not shown good cause for the court to expedite the
4 screening of his complaint.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for the court to expedite
6 the screening of his complaint is DENIED.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 **Dated: June 13, 2010**

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE