

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**

KATHRYN A. LUKENBILL,	)	Case No.: 1:10-cv-01003 NONE JLT
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER DISREGARDING FILING
	)	(Doc. 19)
v.	)	
	)	
DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES	)	
AIR FORCE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

Ms. Lukenbill has filed a document entitled “Consent/Decline of U.S. Magistrate Judge Jurisdiction.” (Doc. 19) On the form, she has typed in “Redaction of Minor’s Information Case 1:10-cv-01003-LJO-JLT Document All.” The Court cannot determine what Ms. Lukenbill is seeking.

If she intends the filing to be a motion to redact the minor’s name, the motion is defective. It does not indicate why, given the fact that the public docket has reflected the child’s<sup>1</sup> name for 10 years, redaction should occur now. Likewise, it fails to outline any legal authority analyzing the issues. Thus, the filing (Doc. 19) is **DISREGARDED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 30, 2020

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

<sup>1</sup> In the order dismissing the case issued in September 2010 (Doc. 18), the Court was uncertain whether the child had achieved the age of majority by that time. Because the events alleged in the complaint involved a 16-year-old, the child is now an adult, who is at least 26.