

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

BRETT LEE WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff,
v.
T. E. HILL, et al.,
Defendants.

1:16-cv-00540-LJO-EPG (PC)
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR A DOCKET CORRECTION WITHOUT
PREJUDICE
(ECF NO. 13)

Brett Williams (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 5, 2017, Plaintiff filed a notice of corrections (ECF No. 13), which the Court construes as a motion for a docket correction.

According to Plaintiff, the Court has the wrong filing date on the docket for the First Amended Complaint. Plaintiff also asks to be excused from compliance with Local Rule 38-183(d), because he cannot access a computer to create .pdf files.

To begin, Local Rule 38-183(d) does not exist. Local Rule 138(d) exists, but it states that *pro se* parties may only file paper documents. Additionally, Local Rule 183(c) states that *pro se* parties are exempted from the requirement of filing documents electronically, and that *pro se* parties must file documents conventionally. There is no requirement that Plaintiff file his

1 documents in PDF.

2 As to Plaintiff's request that the Court correct a docket error, that request will be denied
3 without prejudice. Plaintiff argues (and submits evidence) that the First Amended Complaint was
4 actually filed with this Court on August 5, 2016, not on July 27, 2016, which is the date listed on
5 the docket. However, as evidenced by the stamp on Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (ECF
6 No. 9, p. 1), the July 27, 2016 date was the date Plaintiff attempted to file the document with the
7 Court of Appeals. It is this Court's procedure to use the date provided by the Court of Appeals
8 when the Court of Appeals forwards documents that a party erroneously attempted to file with the
9 Court of Appeals.

10 Moreover, the exact date the First Amended Complaint was filed does not appear to be
11 relevant to any issue currently before the Court. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion will be denied,
12 without prejudice to Plaintiff bringing it again if the date of filing of the First Amended
13 Complaint because relevant.

14 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion
15 for a docket correction is DENIED, without prejudice.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: June 12, 2017

/s/ Eric P. Gray
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28