

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
8

9 AGNES XIE,

Case No. 1:16-cv-01518-DAD-SKO

10 Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING SECOND MOTION
FOR PERMISSION FOR ELECTRONIC
CASE FILING**

11 v.

(Doc. 27)

12 DE YOUNG PROPERTIES, 5867 LP, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14 _____/

15
16 Before the Court is Plaintiff's Second Motion for Permission for Electronic Case Filing
17 (the "Motion"). (Doc. 27.) Local Rule 133(b)(2) provides that "[a]ny person appearing pro se
18 may **not** utilize electronic filing except with the permission of the assigned Judge or Magistrate
19 Judge." Instead, "[a]ll parties shall file and serve paper documents as required by applicable
20 Federal Rules of Civil . . . Procedure or by these [Local] Rules." E.D. Cal. Local Rule 133(b)(2).
21 Nonetheless, a pro se party may "[r]equest to use paper or electronic filing as exceptions from
22 these Rules" if (1) they submit a stipulation between the parties "as provided in [Local Rule] 143;"
23 or (2) "if a stipulation cannot be had," by a "written motion[]" setting out an explanation of reasons
24 for the exception." E.D. Cal. Local Rule 133(b)(3).
25

26 In this case, the parties have not filed a joint stipulation permitting Plaintiff to use
27 electronic filing. Instead, Plaintiff included a request to use electronic filing and an explanation of
28 the basis for this request in the Motion. (*See* Doc. 27 at 1–3.) The Court finds that the explanation

1 provided by Plaintiff in the Motion, (*see id.*), is insufficient to deviate from the default rule that
2 “[a]ny person appearing pro se may **not** utilize electronic filing.” E.D. Cal. Local Rule 133(b)(2).

3 Accordingly, the Court DENIES the Motion. (Doc. 27.)

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: April 25, 2017

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28