

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**

SHAUNTAE TAYLOR,) Case No.: 1:16-cv-00698-LJO-SAB (PC)
)
 Plaintiff,) ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF’S
) OPPOSITION TO CONSENT OF MAGISTRATE
 v.) JUDGE REASSIGNMENT, AND PLAINTIFF’S
) NOTICE REGARDING DEFENDANT’S DECLINE
 C/O J. GREGORY,) OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE JURISDICTION
)
 Defendant.) [ECF Nos. 20, 21]
)
)

Plaintiff Shauntae Taylor is proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On April 28, 2017, Plaintiff filed an opposition stating that he requests that this matter not be reassigned to a magistrate judge for all purposes. (ECF No. 20.) Plaintiff also filed a copy of Defendant’s decline to consent to the jurisdiction of a United States Magistrate Judge, dated April 11, 2017. (ECF No. 21.)

Plaintiff is advised that an action will not be reassigned to a United States Magistrate Judge to conduct all proceedings, including trial and entry of final judgment, unless all parties consent. 28 U.S.C § 636(c). In this case, the parties have not so consented. (ECF Nos. 3, 18.) Further, the parties are advised that withholding to consent or declining the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge for all purposes will have no effect on the merits of a party’s case, or have any adverse substantive consequences.

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

Accordingly, at this time, no further action need be taken regarding Plaintiff's opposition or notice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 1, 2017


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE