

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

BRADY K. ARMSTRONG,

1:11-cv-00761-LJO-GSA-PC

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER RESPONDING TO PLAINTIFF’S  
MOTION FOR STATUS OF CASE  
(Doc. 20.)

A. HEDGPETH, et al.,

Defendants.

Brady K. Armstrong (“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 filed this action on May 11, 2011. (Doc. 1.) On November 2, 2011, Plaintiff was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. (Doc. 7.)

On July 27, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for Plaintiff filed a motion requesting a response from the Court informing him of the status of his case. (Doc. 20.) Plaintiff is advised that his case is on the Court's docket for screening. 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 the Court, and some delays are inevitable despite the Court’s best efforts. With respect to service, the Court will, *sua sponte*,

1 direct the United States Marshal to serve the complaint only after the Court has screened the  
2 complaint and determined that it contains cognizable claims for relief against the named  
3 defendants.

4 Plaintiff can rest assured that he will receive all orders issued in his case as long as he  
5 keeps the Court apprised of his current address.

6 Plaintiff's motion is hereby RESOLVED by this order.

7  
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 **Dated: July 30, 2012**

**/s/ Gary S. Austin**  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE