

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EUGENE E. FORTE,
Plaintiff,

v.

MERCED COUNTY, *et al.*,
Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:15-cv-0147 KJM-BAM

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S EX
PARTE MOTIONS**

(Docs. 22, 24, 25).

The Court has received and reviewed the multiple *ex parte* requests by plaintiff. (Docs. 22, 24, 25). Plaintiff *filed ex parte* applications requesting service of his First Amended Complaint on the thirty-seven defendants named in this action. Plaintiff also requests the issuance of a pre-trial scheduling order and a ruling on his request to participate in electronic filing via CM/ECF. Plaintiff’s requests are DENIED.

Plaintiff is appearing *pro se* and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, 1985, 1986, and 1988. In cases involving a plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis, a defendant is not served until after the complaint is screened and cognizable claims are found. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), (d), (e)(2)(B); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3). The Court screens complaints in the order in which they are filed and strives to avoid delays whenever possible. While the Court uses its best efforts to resolve this case and all other civil cases in a timely manner, Plaintiff is admonished that not all of Plaintiff’s needs and expectations may be met as expeditiously as desired. This Court is faced

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

with literally hundreds of pro se filings, each requiring judicial time and limited judicial resources. Accordingly, the Court will address this matter in due course.

Similarly, Plaintiff's related request for a scheduling order is premature as the Court has not screened the First Amended Complaint. Thus, Plaintiff's request for a scheduling order is DENIED.

Finally, Plaintiff's request to file documents electronically in the Court's CM/ECF system is also DENIED. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint is pending and will be screened in due course. Until such time as Plaintiff is found to state a cognizable claim pursuant to screening standards, Plaintiff is denied electronic filing status.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 15, 2015

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE