Greenblatt v.	Patel, et al.	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	SHAWN GREENBLATT,	1:12-cv-00046-SKO (PC)
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
11	vs.	FOR SERVICE OF COMPLAINT AS PREMATURE
12	PATEL, et al.,	(Doc. 7)
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	On January 23, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking service of his complaint by the	
16	United States Marshal. Plaintiff is entitled to the appointment of the Marshal to serve process on	
17	his behalf because he is proceeding in forma pauperis. 28 U.S.C. §1915(d); Fed. R. Civ. P.	
18	4(c)(3). However, the Marshal will not be directed by the Court to initiate service of the	
19	complaint until the Court has screened Plaintiff's complaint and determined that it states	
20	cognizable claims. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Plaintiff is directed to review paragraph 12 of the First	
21	Information Order, which sets forth an explanation regarding screening and service of process.	
22	(Doc. 3.)	
23	For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff's motion for service of his complaint is	
24	HEREBY DENIED as premature.	
25		
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
27	Dated: January 27, 2012 UNITE	/s/ Sheila K. Oberto ED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28	CIVILD STITLD MINOISTICTL VED GE	
	-1-	

Doc. 9