

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

TRACY TAYLOR,	CASE NO. 1:11-cv-00538-LJO-SAB (PC)
Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S REQUESTS FOR COURT TO SCREEN COMPLAINT
v.	(ECF Nos. 13 & 21)
SHAY OHANNESSON, et al.,	
Defendants.	

Plaintiff Tracy Taylor (“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’s civil action was originally filed on March 31, 2011 and a first amended complaint was filed on August 31, 2012. On August 13, 2012 and January 24, 2013, Plaintiff filed motions for determination of his case. The present motion notes the reassignment of his case was due to a new magistrate judge being appointed and requests that his case be screened before the Defendants “retire or transfer.”

The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a government entity or officer or employee of a government entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). This Court and its staff takes its role serious in complying with statutes and other obligations under the United States Constitution and laws of the United States. As Plaintiff’s case is not the only case under consideration by the Court and because cases are screened in the order in which they are filed, absent good cause, the Court will screen cases in that order and will continue to strive to avoid delays whenever possible.

In essence, Plaintiff seeks in his motions to have his complaint screened before other

1 similarly situated plaintiffs who also allege violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. I find that Plaintiff's
2 motions do not establish good cause to have his case heard before other similarly situated cases.

3 Accordingly,

4 Plaintiff's motions filed August 13, 2012 (ECF No. 13) and January 24, 2013 (ECF No. 21)
5 are hereby DENIED.

6
7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: January 28, 2013

/s/ Stanley A. Boone
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE