IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BERTRAM JAM WESTBROOK, Plaintiff, vs. MATTHEW CATE, et al., Defendants.	Case No. 1:10-cv-01089 LJO JLT (PC) ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED SCREENING AS MOOT (Doc. 9)

On September 6, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion for expedited screening of his complaint. (Doc. 9) In it, Plaintiff "reminded" the Court of the amount of time that had passed since he filed the action. Id.

Plaintiff is assured the Court is well-aware of his complaint and, in fact, screened it in due course on October 20, 2011. (Doc. 10) However, Plaintiff is advised that this Court is one of the busiest in the entire nation and that it carries more prisoner cases that any other court. Forcing the Court to consider his current request and those like them, merely delay the Court from deciding cases, like his and those brought by other inmates. In any event, because Plaintiff's complaint has been screened, the motion to expedite screening is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 28, 2011**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE