

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

REGINALD RAY YORK,
Plaintiff,
v.
G. GARCIA, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:15-cv-01828-DAD-BAM
ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS’
REQUEST FOR A SCREENING ORDER
(Doc. No. 50)

On May 9, 2018, defendants filed a request for a ruling by the district judge on a prior screening order issued by the assigned magistrate judge in this case. (Doc. No. 50.) Particularly, defendants seek a ruling on the magistrate judge’s order of June 22, 2016. (Doc. No. 8.) A review of the court’s docket shows that the ruling sought by defendants is unnecessary.

The magistrate judge entered a screening order in this case on June 22, 2016. Doc. No. 8.) Plaintiff objected to this screening order on July 18, 2016. (Doc. No. 9.) The undersigned construed these objections as a request for reconsideration under Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and denied it on November 3, 2016. (Doc. No. 10.) On November 8, 2016, the magistrate judge filed another order requiring plaintiff to file an amended complaint or notify the court of his willingness to proceed only on his claims found to be cognizable. (Doc. No. 11.) Plaintiff filed a notice on November 18, 2016 indicating he did not wish to file an amended complaint and would instead proceed on the claims previously found cognizable by the court.

1 (Doc. No. 12.) On January 10, 2017, the undersigned issued an order dismissing certain claims
2 and defendants, and directing the case to proceed against the defendants on the claims previously
3 cognizable by the magistrate judge. (Doc. No. 17.)

4 The Ninth Circuit's holding in *Williams v. King*, 875 F.3d 500 (9th Cir. 2017) held a
5 magistrate judge lacks jurisdiction to dismiss a complaint unless all parties, both those already
6 appearing before the court as well as those who have not yet appeared, have consented to
7 magistrate judge jurisdiction. Here, it was the undersigned, and not a magistrate judge, who
8 dismissed plaintiff's claims and certain named defendants from this action. (Doc. No. 17.)
9 *Williams* is therefore inapplicable and, defendants' request is, accordingly, denied.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: May 11, 2018

12 
13 _____
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28