Second, the Eastern District of California has not had a new judgeship in about 30 years. Thus, the same number of judicial officers is handling exponentially more cases now than the same number of judges handled 30 years ago. As it stands, the Fresno Division has only one active district judge and one part-time senior district judge who are constitutionally obligated to place priority on criminal matters. Despite this, more than half of the civil cases filed in the District are filed in the Fresno Division. The Sacramento Division has four active district judges and two senior district judges so the Court has been forced to redirect many of the civil cases filed in the Fresno Division to the Sacramento Division. At the outset of this case, the parties were reminded of this judicial crisis and were advised that their case had been randomly selected to be reassigned to the Sacramento Division. (Doc. 17-1)

The impacts of the judicial crisis are easy to track. Assuming a District Judge ever finds time to try the case, it takes longer for cases to come to trial, litigants are forced to have their trials continued many times before they are heard, trials may trail from day-to-day until the District Judge has time to hear them or trials are interrupted, once started, to allow the District Judge to take matters of higher priority.

Until change occurs, the Court must employ all reasonable tactics to attempt to advance the cases through the system. Here, the parties are allowed the option of consenting to magistrate judge jurisdiction—and allow their case to proceed in a convenient location in a timely fashion—or, to decline this option and allow the case to proceed in Sacramento. The Court understands the frustration of counsel and hardship on the parties if the matter is transferred to Sacramento but unless and until this Court is afforded additional judicial resources, it simply cannot continue to hear the multitude of civil cases field in the Fresno Division.

If Plaintiff affirmatively consents to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction, all hearings will remain in the Fresno Division and will not be transferred to Sacramento. The trial would occur in Bakersfield which would ease the Plaintiff's ability to present witnesses who, in all likelihood, are located in Bakersfield. Just as with a final judgment issued by a District Judge, any appeal from the final judgment issued by the Magistrate Judge would proceed in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Plaintiff may consent or withhold consent to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction without any adverse substantive consequences. However, in the event that Plaintiff does not consent, all hearings and the

trial will occur in Sacramento. Moreover, if the trial occurs in Sacramento, the parties' ability to compel witnesses to appear at the trial may be reduced. Therefore, within 10 days, Plaintiff is ORDERED to file his consent or decline to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge. The Clerk of the Court is **DIRCTED** to provide Plaintiff a form for that purpose. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: **November 18, 2014**