

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GORDON C. REID,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:14-cv-01163-LJO-MJS (PC)  
**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
EXPEDITE INITIAL SCREENING  
(ECF No. 39)**

Plaintiff is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights and tort action brought pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) and the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2671-2680. Before the Court is Plaintiff’s “Motion to Expedite Initial Screening.” (ECF No. 39.)

Plaintiff initiated this action on July 25, 2014. (ECF No. 1.) His complaint was screened four months later on November 24, 2014. (ECF No. 13.) The Court concluded that Plaintiff failed to state a claim and he was given leave to amend. (Id.) Thereafter, Plaintiff filed several motions for extensions of time (ECF Nos. 14, 15, 19), a variety of other motions (ECF Nos. 16, 17, 18), and a baseless interlocutory appeal (ECF No. 20).

Following dismissal of his appeal on April 13, 2015 (ECF No. 23), Plaintiff’s outstanding motions were resolved on April 27 and May 12, 2015, respectively (ECF

1 Nos. 24, 25). Plaintiff was ordered to file an amended complaint and did so on June 24,  
2 2015. (ECF No. 28.) The first amended complaint was screened promptly on July 28,  
3 2015, just over one month later. (ECF No. 31.) Plaintiff was ordered to file an amended  
4 complaint or notify the Court of his willingness to proceed only on claims found to be  
5 cognizable.

6 Plaintiff instead filed multiple motions for extensions of time (ECF Nos. 32, 35, 37)  
7 and, ultimately, on October 26, 2015, a motion for reconsideration by the District Judge  
8 (ECF No. 38). Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration presently remains pending before the  
9 District Judge and will be addressed in due course.

10 Plaintiff's complaint and first amended complaint were promptly screened by the  
11 Court. Delays in moving this case past the screening stage are attributable for the most  
12 part to Plaintiff's numerous requests for extensions of time, as well as his interlocutory  
13 appeal. As Plaintiff previously was informed (ECF No. 24), the Fresno Division of the  
14 United States District Court for the Eastern District of California carries one of the busiest  
15 dockets in the country. Despite this caseload, Plaintiff's submissions have heretofore  
16 promptly been addressed. The Court will endeavor to continue to do so. At the present  
17 time, however, there is no pleading for the Court to screen and Plaintiff must await  
18 disposition of his motion for reconsideration by the District Judge.

19  
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: March 31, 2016

22 /s/ Michael J. Seng  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28