(HC) Smith v. Mi	ns et al	Doc.
1		
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$		
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
4	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
5	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
6	CLEVELAND SMITH,	Case No. 1:14-cv-00841-LJO-GSA-HC
7	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR EXPEDITED SCREENING [Doc. #15]
8	v.	
9	MARGARETTE MIMS, Sheriff,	
10	Respondent.	
11		
12	Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus.	
13	On August 18, 2014, Petitioner filed a motion to expedite proceedings in the pending petition	
14	for writ of habeas corpus. As Petitioner correctly states, the instant action is pending before this	
15	Court. However, the Court does not have an expedited calendar. Petitioner is advised that the Court	
16	acts to resolve all pending cases in the most efficient manner possible. The Court is aware of	
17	Petitioner's pending petition. Nevertheless, the Court's docket of pending cases is substantial, and the	
18	Court must act first on those matters that have been pending the longest.	
19	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's motion to expedite the pending	
20	petition for writ of habeas corpus is DENIED.	
21		
22		
23	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
24	Dated: September 19, 2014	/s/ Gary S. Austin
25	Ţ	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26		
27		
28		
		1

Doc. 16