

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

MATTHEW JAMES GRIFFIN,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.)
)
 FERNANDO GONZALES, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)
 _____)

1:11-cv-00210-AWI-GSA-PC
ORDER RE MOTION FOR SERVICE
(Doc. 10.)
ORDER DISREGARDING PROPOSED
VOIR DIRE QUESTIONS
(Doc. 11.)

Matthew James Griffin ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed the Complaint commencing this action on January 28, 2011. (Doc. 1.)

On August 18, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion for the Court to commence service of process in this action. (Doc. 10.) Before service of process, 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). As a rule, the Court screens complaints in the order in which they are filed and strives to avoid delays whenever possible. However, there are hundreds of prisoner civil rights cases presently pending before this Court, and delays are inevitable despite the Court's best efforts. Plaintiff's case has been placed on the Court's screening schedule and will be screened in due time. The Court will, *sua sponte*, direct the United States Marshal to serve the complaint after the Court has screened the complaint and determined that it contains cognizable claims for relief against the named defendants.

1 On September 6, 2011, Plaintiff submitted proposed voir dire questions to the Court. (Doc. 11.)
2 Plaintiff is advised that submission of these questions is premature in this action. Should this case
3 proceed to trial, Plaintiff shall be granted the opportunity to submit proposed voir dire questions at a later
4 stage of the proceedings. Should Plaintiff wish to submit proposed voir dire questions for the Court's
5 review, he must re-submit them at a later time. The proposed questions submitted on September 6, 2011
6 shall be disregarded by the Court.

7 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8 1. Plaintiff's motion for service, filed on August 18, 2011, is RESOLVED by this order; and
- 9 2. Plaintiff's proposed voir dire questions, submitted to the Court on September 6, 2011, are
10 premature and shall be DISREGARDED.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: September 7, 2011

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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