

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL SANDS,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
MARLENE SMITH, et al.,  
Defendants.

1:14-cv-01780-GSA-PC

**ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR  
SCREENING ORDER**

**ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF  
TIME TO FILE RESPONSE TO  
COMPLAINT**

This is a civil action filed by Michael Sands (“Plaintiff”), a state prisoner proceeding pro se. This action was initiated by civil complaint filed by Plaintiff in the Kings County Superior Court on July 30, 2014 (Case #14-C0226). On November 12, 2014, defendants Marlene Robicheaux-Smith, Natalie Clark, and Antoneya Graves (“Defendants”) removed the case to federal court by filing a Notice of Removal of Action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(c). (Doc. 2.) Within the Notice of Removal, Defendants requested the court to screen Plaintiff’s complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and grant Defendants an extension of time in which to file a responsive pleading. (*Id.* at 2:9-3:3.)

The Court is required to screen complaints in civil actions in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Plaintiff's complaint alleges that Defendants, employees of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) at Corcoran State Prison in Corcoran,

1 California, violated his rights under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.  
2 Because Plaintiff is a prisoner and Defendants were employees of the CDCR at a state prison  
3 when the alleged events occurred, the court is required to screen the complaint. Therefore,  
4 Defendants' motion for the Court to screen the complaint shall be granted. In addition, good  
5 cause appearing, the motion for extension of time shall also be granted.

6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

7 1. Defendants' motion for the Court to screen the complaint is GRANTED, and the  
8 court shall issue a screening order in due time;

9 2. Defendants are GRANTED an extension of time until thirty days from the date  
10 of service of the Court's screening order in which to file a response to the  
11 complaint.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.  
13

14 Dated: November 21, 2014

15 /s/ Gary S. Austin  
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28