

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

8 MARK SCHMIDT,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 RODRIGUES, et al.,

12 Defendants.
13

) Case No.: 1:14-cv-01092-SAB (PC)

)
) ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
) TO COMPEL THE COURT TO SEND A SIGNED
) COPY OF THE ORDER DIRECTING SERVICE
) BY THE UNITED STATES MARSHAL

) [ECF No. 27]
)
)

14 Plaintiff Mark Schmidt is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action
15 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

16 On May 1, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel requesting the Clerk of Court to send him a
17 copy of the Court's April 2, 2015, with an original signature by the undersigned.

18 Plaintiff is advised that pursuant to the Local Rules of this Court the use of electronic
19 signatures is permitted. See Local Rules 101, 131. An electronic signature is authorized and carries
20 the same weight as that of a handwritten signature. Thus, Plaintiff's preference for a handwritten
21 signature provides no basis to challenge the legality and enforcement of the Court's April 2, 2015,
22 order, and his motion to compel a copy of the order with a handwritten signature is DENIED.

23
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: May 4, 2015



26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27
28