

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 SAIYEZ AHMED,
9 Plaintiff,
10 v.
11 M. MARTEL, et al.,
12 Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-00941-DAD-MJS (PC)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
REQUEST FOR SCREENING ORDER
AND EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
RESPONSIVE PLEADING**

(ECF No. 43)

13
14 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil
15 rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court screened Plaintiff's first amended
16 complaint and found that it stated cognizable First Amendment retaliation claims against
17 Defendants Martel, Davis, Shannon, Cano, and Combs. (ECF No. 13.) Defendants
18 moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim. (ECF No. 17.) The motion
19 was granted and Plaintiff was given leave to amend. (ECF No. 32.) Plaintiff filed his
20 second amended complaint on October 5, 2016. (ECF No. 42.)

21 Defendants request that the Court screen Plaintiff's complaint in accordance with
22 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The request is **HEREBY GRANTED**. The Court will screen
23 Plaintiff's complaint in due course.

24 Defendants also ask that they not be required to answer or otherwise defend this
25 action, and that no other defendants be served, until the screening order issues. This
26 request is **HEREBY GRANTED**. Defendants shall respond to Plaintiff's amended
27 complaint within thirty days of the order adopting the Court's screening order, if any
28

1 claims are found to be cognizable. The Court will issue further orders regarding the
2 service of additional defendants, if appropriate, after screening the complaint.

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: November 8, 2016

6 /s/ Michael J. Seng
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28