

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

SUSAN MAE POLK,	)	1:11-cv-00728-AWI- BAM (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
	)	OBJECTIONS TO SCREENING ORDER
v.	)	DISMISSING THIRD AMENDED
	)	COMPLAINT
PITTMAN, et al.,	)	(ECF No. 85)
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Susan Mae Polk (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 22, 2014, the Magistrate Judge screened Plaintiff’s third amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and determined that it failed to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8 and 18. The Magistrate Judge dismissed Plaintiff’s third amended complaint with leave to amend within thirty days. (ECF No. 83.)

On January 22, 2015, Plaintiff requested an extension of time to March 26, 2015, to file her amended complaint. (ECF No. 84.) On the same date, Plaintiff filed objections to the Magistrate Judge’s screening order dismissing the third amended complaint with leave to amend. (ECF No. 85.)

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 303(b), a ruling by a Magistrate Judge is final within 14 days of  
2 service of the order. See Local Rule 303(b). Similarly, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a)  
3 provides that a party may file objections to a Magistrate Judge's orders within 14 days. See Fed.  
4 R. Civ. P. 72(a). Here, Plaintiff filed the instant objections more than thirty days after service of  
5 the Magistrate Judge's screening order. Plaintiff's objections are untimely. See Fed. R. Civ. P.  
6 72; Local Rule 303. Because the objections are untimely, they will be denied. See id.

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's objections are DENIED.

8  
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: March 31, 2015

11   
12 \_\_\_\_\_  
13 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28