

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 REQUEST
v.	FOR COURT TO SCREEN COMPLAINT AND
	SERVE THE SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT
SHAY OHANNESSON, et al.,	(ECF No. 23)
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 requesting the Court to screen his complaint. (ECF Nos. 13 & 21.) On January 28, 2013, the Court denied the motions for failure to show good cause. (ECF No. 22.) On February 15, 2013, Plaintiff filed a third motion requesting the Court to screen his complaint and serve the summons and complaint. (ECF No. 23.)

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). As noted previously, 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 this 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 strive to avoid delays whenever possible. Absent good cause, the Court will not entertain motions

1 to have complaints screened before other similarly situated plaintiff's who also allege violations of
2 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff's repetitive requests for screening only takes time away from the Court's
3 ability to actually screen cases.

4 I find that Plaintiff's motion still does not establish good cause to have his case heard before
5 other similarly situated cases. Accordingly,

6 Plaintiff's motion filed February 15, 2013 (ECF No. 23) is hereby DENIED.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 **Dated: February 19, 2013**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE