

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

LARRY FREEMAN,
Plaintiff,
v.
ST. CLAIR, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00621-AWI-BAM (PC)
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR SERVICE
(ECF No. 7)

Plaintiff Larry Freeman (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Currently before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion requesting a notice of service of the complaint, which the Court construes as a motion for service of the complaint. (ECF No. 7.)

Plaintiff is advised that the Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The Court will direct service of process only after Plaintiff’s complaint has been screened and found to state cognizable claims for relief. Once the complaint is screened and found to have stated a cognizable claim against any defendant, a copy of the complaint will be sent to Plaintiff with service documents to be completed.

The Court screens complaints in the order in which they are filed and strives to avoid delays whenever possible. However, there are hundreds of prisoner civil rights cases presently

1 pending before the Court, and delays are inevitable. Plaintiff's complaint will be screened in due
2 course.

3 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for service, (ECF No. 7), is HEREBY DENIED without
4 prejudice, as premature.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: November 27, 2018

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
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