

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RUMALDO BARBOZA,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
BERRY GREEN,  
Defendant.

Case No. 1:12-cv-01914 AWI JLT (PC)  
**ORDER DENYING EX PARTE  
REQUEST FOR DEFENDANT’S HOME  
ADDRESS**  
(Doc. 4)

On November 26, 2012, Plaintiff initiated this action. (Doc. 1) At the same time, he filed a motion for the Court to order Pleasant Valley State Prison to divulge the personal address of the Defendant. (Doc. 4) Plaintiff’s rationale is that the US Marshals Service will need this address if Defendant is no longer employed by the CDCR. Id.

However, Plaintiff is advised that according to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must screen Plaintiff’s to determine whether it states a cognizable claim. Until the Court orders the complaint to be served, if it does, the location where Defendant may be served is not needed. Moreover, unless and until it is determined that Defendant can no longer be served via his work place, investigation into alternate locations for service is not needed.

Thus, any request for discovery of Defendant’s location via his employer is premature given the Court has not screened Plaintiff’s complaint to determine whether it states a cognizable

1 claim and the Court has not authorized service of the complaint. Therefore, the motion for  
2 disclosure of Defendant's home address is **DENIED.**

3

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5

Dated: December 12, 2012

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28